



500

1571

c. 1

A
DEFENCE
OF THE
CHURCH-GOVERNMENT,
FAITH, WORSHIP &
SPIRIT
OF THE
Presbyterians.

In ANSWER to a late Book Intituled,
An APOLOGY for Mr THOMAS
RHIND. Or an Account of the *Man-
ner* how and the *Reasons* for which he
Separated from the *Presbyterian* Party,
and embraced the Communion of the
CHURCH.

By JOHN ANDERSON M.A. Minister of the Gospel
in DUMBARTON.

I John II. 19. *They went out from us, but they were not of us: -----*

G L A S G O W,
Printed by HUGH BROWN. M. DCC. XIV.

T O

The Right Honourable

ARCHIBALD,

EARL of *ILAY*,

LORD-JUSTICE-GENERAL,
of the Kingdom of *Scotland*,

One of the Extraordinary Lords

O F

SESSION,

A N D

Governour of *Dumbarton-Castle*.

My Lord,



Have, upon moe Accounts than
one Presum'd to Shelter this
Book under *Your* Patronage.

THE

D E D I C A T I O N.

THE Great Family, whence You are Sprung; and whereof You are so Bright an Ornament, has always, since the first Dawn of the *Reformation*, Patroniz'd the Cause therein Defended. They have Manag'd it by their *Wisdom*, Protected it with Their *Sword*, Adorn'd it by Their *Lives*, and too often Sealed it with Their *Blood*. Yet even this was a Fate rather to be Envied than Lamented. For, to fall a Sacrifice at once for Their GOD and Their Country; To be transmitted to Posterity under the united Characters of *MARTYR* and *PATRIOT*; This, *MY LORD*, was, next to the Enjoyment of Heaven, the highest Glory Great and Virtuous Souls cou'd attain to.

I need not tell *Your Lordship* that the same Cause is still in Hazard. It is Lampoon'd in the *Tavern*, Declaim'd against from the *Pulpit*, Scribbl'd at from the *Press*, and its Ruin Projected by the Dealers in the *Politicks*. Yet all the Nation is Persuaded, that it is no less the Inclination,

DEDICATION.

tion, than 'tis visibly the Interest of the Family of ARGYLE heartily to espouse it: And all the Owners of that Interest, that is, the Wiser and Better and far Greater Part of the Nation, have necessarily such an Opinion of the Personal sufficiency of the Principal Members of that House, as to found the greatest Expectations thereon.

YOUR Illustrious Brother, The DUKE, has rais'd Himself to an Unrival'd Glory, and Distinguish'd Himself as the *HERO* of the Age.

YOU, *My Lord*, not contented to excell in those Exercises, which are too often the only Accomplishment of Persons distinguish'd by Their Birth, not satisfied to have Adorn'd Your Mind with that which is call'd the *Polite* Part of Learning; and, by a True Taste of the *Belles Lettres*, and uncommon Advances in the *Mathematicks* and all the most valuable Parts of Philosophy, to make Your Conversation both Shining and Instructive. Not satisfied, I say,

* ⊕
* ●

with

DEDICATION.

with all this, You have besides, that you might be a Publick Good to your Country, stock'd Your Soul with so Exact and Extensive a Knowledge of the *Laws*, that you are Distinguish'd on the Bench by your *Ability* no less than by Your *Quality*: And the whole *Nation* finds it self Happy in Her *Majesty's* Wise Choice of *Your Lordship* to bear so great a Part in those *Courts*, on the Sentences of which their *Lives* and *Fortunes* depend.

THO' then, *My Lord*, the Weaknesses of the Book are *Mine* only, and so can no Way affect *Your Lordship*; yet the *Subject* of it, and the *Cause* it appears for, necessarily intitle it to the Patronage of a Person of your Character: You, *My Lord*, know that the *Presbyterian* Establishment in *Scotland* can never be overthrown; without breaking through whatever has been hitherto held *Sacred* among Men. And *Your Lordship* knows, there is no Cause why it shou'd be attempted.

THO²

DEDICATION.

THO' the *High-Church* Faction, with whom *Modesty* and *Moderation* are reckon'd Scandal, has taught her *Profelyts* to Charge the *Presbyterians* with a *SPIRIT* *Diametrically Opposite* to that of the *Gospel*; Yet, You, *My Lord*, from Your own Personal Acquaintance with 'em, know, how False and Calumnious that Charge is. As 'tis Evident, to the Observation of all the World, that They are the most serious Christians; So Your Lordship is abundantly convinced, that They are the most Faithfull Subjects Her Majesty has on this Side the Border.

THEY don't indeed allow of a *WORSHIP* Fring'd with *Ceremonies* of Human Invention and Imposition. But, I'm perswaded, a Person of Your Lordship's Reflection must needs be sensible that a Minister of GOD never makes a more Unfightly Figure, than when Appearing in a Party-Colour'd Dress, and Practising Motions and Postures His Heavenly Master never enjoin'd Him. 'Tis True the *Presbyterians*

D E D I C A T I O N.

terians don't restrict themselves to *Forms* in Praying to Almighty GOD: But, I suppose, *Your Lordship* does not think a Begger ever the less Sincere, tho' he don't always ask his Alms in the same studied *Cant*.

'TIS Confess'd likewise, there are several *ARTICLES OF FAITH* taught by the *Presbyterians*, which are above the Comprehension of Our finite Minds: But *Your Lordship*, who, every Day, in the Search of *Nature*, find so many *Appearances* perfectly Unaccountable from the *Laws of Mechanism*, without having Recourse to the First Mover and great Author of *Nature*, can't be surpriz'd to find *Articles in Religion* not otherwise to be Resolv'd, but by Believing That *GOD's Judgments are Unsearchable and His Ways past finding out*. Nor will *Your Lordship*, I presume, be straitned to Believe, that the whole *Christian Church*, which has Taught those Articles equally with the *Presbyterians*, is as likely to be in the Right, as an
Upstart

DEDICATION.

Upstart Sect of yesterday, whose *Confidence* is their most Usefull Quality.

IN a Word, *My Lord*, the *Presbyterians* disown a *PRELACY* among the Ministers of the Gospel: And, on this Score, *High-Church* finds in Her Heart to Damn 'em by the Lump, and Mercitully to consign 'em to Everlasting Flames. But *Your Lordship* has a juster Notion of the Kind Author of our Being, than to Believe that He will Ruine His Creatures for not Submitting to a *Government*, which its Freshest and most Learn'd Patrons own, is not to be found in the *ORACLES OF TRUTH*.

I have therefore adventur'd to Inscribe this Piece to *Your Lordship*; not doubting but, how Weak soever the *Performance* may be, that yet an *Essay* to Defend so very Good a Cause, wherein not only *Truth*, but *Peace*, *Charity* and *Good Neighbourhood* are so much concern'd, will not be quite Ungratefull to You.

DEDICATION.

THAT *Your Lordship* may be always
Blessed with the Richest Favours of Heaven,
is, and shall be the Daily Prayer of

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's

most Humble, and

most Obedient Servant

JOHN ANDERSON.

THE PREFACE.

BEING *Sensible that Books always occasion an Expence of Money, and, which is much more valuable, of Time; I think my self obliged to account, why I have given the Publick the Trouble of this.*

HOW soon the APOLOGY appeared; that Party, which is distinguish'd by the Name of HIGH-CHURCH, Gloried both in the Author and in the Service He had done. They Spread His Book with great Industry into the several Parts of the Nation, Recommended it as a Perfect Piece in its Kind, and at length Boasted it made Profelyts.

I hate to Grudge even an Adversary His due Praise. I frankly own, Mr. Rhind has done as well as the Subject was Capable of. I own, His Book is, of its Bulk; the most Comprehensive in its Subject, I have seen. Some Authors have attaqued Us upon the Head of GOVERNMENT, some upon our DOCTRINE, some upon our WORSHIP, and some too (tho' these not always excessively Qualified, either Morally or Intellectually, for such an Undertaking) upon our SPIRIT and PRACTICE. But Mr. Rhind has wi'd'ned the Compass, and taken all Four within His Circle, hinting at every Thing, of a General Nature, that has been wont to be objected to us; and all this in so very Pointed a Stile, that, had His Probation been equal, there had been an End of the matter, and the World had heard its last of Presbytry for ever.

II The P R E F A C E.

IT might then possibly have argued, either too much Indolence, or an Ill Conscience, to have neglected such a Book, without either Answering or Confessing to it. Nor is it quite Improbable that Silence wou'd have heightned the Vanity of a Party abundantly remarkable already for that Quality. I cannot deny but these Considerations somewhat Influenced me to write.

BUT then, That which Determin'd me, was the Consideration of the Design of Mr. Rhind's Book, and of the Effect it must necessarily have, so far as it Persuades. And who knows how far it may do so? Mankind grows Daily more Corrupt; and Mr. Rhind is very far from being singular in what He has advanced, most Part of Books we get from High-Church being of the same Strain, and Breathing the very same Spirit.

NOW what else is the Design of Mr. Rhind's Book, but to overturn the most Sacred and Important Truths? And what else can the Effect of it be, so far as it obtains Credit, but the Utmost Contempt of Seriousness and Piety; which, GOD knows, is at too low an Ebb already on both sides? What else is the Design of it, but to Exasperate the one Half of the Nation into Rage and Fury against the other? And, shou'd it gain Faith, how Dire must the Consequences be? Then must Love, Peace, and Charity be for ever Banish'd, a State of Universal Hostility instantly commence, Persecution, in all its most terrible Forms, take Place, till not only Presbytry be abolish'd, but the whole Generation of Presbyterians be Extirpated from off the Face of the Earth, which, I suppose will hardly ever be, so long as there is a Bible on it.

THAT Unhappy Fellow De Foe, some Ten or Twelve Years ago, put all England in a Ferment by His **SHORTEST WAY WITH THE DISSENTERS**. But what else is His Shortest Way, but the Immediate Use of the Doctrine laid down in Mr. Rhind's Book, and indeed generally in all the Controversial Books, and oftimes in the Sermons, of High-Church? For

The P R E F A C E. III.

*IF the Presbyterian Pastors are no Minilters; If their Sacraments are null; If all, who are of that Communion, are out of the Ordinary Road to Heaven, and can have no Rational Hope of Salvation; Does it not unavoidably follow that it is the Duty of Our Civil Governours to overturn their Settlement? Is it not plain that They are in a State of Deadly Sin so long as They leave it undone? Were it not an ACT of Great Mercy, and Christian Compassion to COMPELL us to come in, tho' it were by the Rough Arguments of Heading, Hanging and such like, rather than suffer us to go into Hell Fire Our selves, and lead others thither, with the Limbs intire? If Presbyterians are not only without the Church, but Enemies to it, what can the STATE in Conscience do, but Declare them to be denuded of all those Immunities and Priviledges which the Law had secur'd 'em in, and which hitherto They have enjoyed in Common with Their Neighbours, upon the Presumption of Their being Christians? If Presbyterian Parity is so Inconsistent in its own Nature with Monarchy, are not the Civil Powers obliged for Their own Security to crush a Society of so Dangerous a Constitution? If the Presbyterian Spirit is Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel, what Eternal Animosities must there be 'twixt True Church and such a Party? Is it possible but that, upon such a Supposition, there must be Constant and Mortal Feuds in every the same City, the same Congregation, the same Family, and oftentimes in the same Bed? For, what shou'd an Episcopal Husband, who wou'd not pass for Hen-peck'd *, do with a Wife who is Incurably Presbyterian? Shall He still cherish the Serpent in His Bosom till She sting him to Death? Shall he hug the Charming Tempter till she Teaze him into the Devouring Jaws of the Old Serpent by Her Bewitching Importunities? Must not then all Things run into Confusion upon such Principles? 'Tis True, Almighty Providence may restrain such Dismal Effects, or Good Nature may overcome bad Principles; but such, I'm sure, are the Native Consequences of 'em, and are Daily put in Practice in all the Popish Countries; too sure a Sign (besides the Proof of former Experience) that not Will, but Power only, is wanting to act the same Tragical*

† †

Scenes

Scenes in Britain. And what less shou'd be expected from a Party, which justifies all that Carnage the French King has made of His Protestant Subjects †?

THIS then being the Natural Product of the Principles of Mr. Rhind's Book, I thought I owed this Service not only to the Truth but to My Country; And that I was obliged to bring my Bucket, tho' a shallow one, to Quench that Flame which, if not suppress'd in Time, must needs Consume it to Ashes, and bring us to the same miserable State which, Josephus tells us, the Zealots brought Jerusalem into before its Destruction. This, I hope, will not only excuse but Justify my Writing.

BUT then the next Question will be, Why so largely? Was it so very hard a Matter to Answer Mr. Rhind, that no less than a Book about Four Times the Bigness of His cou'd serve the Turn? His Singularities are but few, and might have been quickly discuss'd; nor had the Reader been at any Great Loss, tho' they had been quite neglected. What else He has advanced has been brought into the Field a Hundred Times before, and it might have been Sufficient for Answer to have recommended the Reader to former Writers on the same Subjects. Besides, He has very often through His Book, and upon the Spirit of the Presbyterians always, contented Himself with meer Assertion: And, in such Cases, 'tis still as Honourable to deny without a Reason, as it was to assert without a Proof.

ALL this I acknowledge is very True; and such a Conduct, 'tis plain, had brought my Book within a very Moderate Compass: But then too, such a Conduct had sunk its Usefulness proportionally with its Bulk: For I did Intend by it, and shall be sorry if the Reader find himself disappointed, somewhat more than a Simple Confutation of the Apology: I design'd it shou'd be of Universal Use in this Controversy; and therefore have not barely Deny'd, which in very many Cases

† See afterward p. 69.

Cases had been enough for our Apologist, and wou'd have very much shortned the Work; but I have Disproved too: Nor have I put off the Reader with Answering Mr. Rhind, but have said as much as I thought Sufficient to Satisfie the Argument it self by whoever it were manag'd.

PLAINLY I design'd, In the First Place, to say as much as was needfull to Vindicate the Presbyterians from those Imputations in Fact which fill so many Hundreds of the Episcopal Sermons, Books and Pamphlets, and are so much the Subject of their Conversation. If in doing this I have mention'd any Facts on their Side, the hearing whereof may be Grateing to them, they hope themselves to blame: For every one must own, it was a very proper Way in Me, for Disproving the Reasons of Mr. Rhind's Conduct, to make it appear, that the Side He had espoused lay every Way as open to Exceptions as that He had Deserted: Here then the Old Apology takes Place

-----Sciāt

Responsum, non Dictum esse, quia læsit prius.

But then, which will sufficiently distinguish my Managment, the Reader may Promise Himself to find My Assertions verified, in all Cases needfull, by the most Authentick and Unexceptionable Documents, a Piece of Drudgery which Mr. Rhind has, and the Writers of His Party generally do, excuse themselves from. 2dly, I design'd to say as much as I thought needfull for Convincing any Man's Conscience that the Presbyterian Communion is not only Safe but the Best, both as to Government, Faith and Worship. And as the Reader will find all the Arguments for Prelacy particularly Discoursed; so, which I doubt not will be surprizing enough, He will find my Reasonings against 'em Fortified by the Judgment even of the most eminent Divines of the Church of England who habitually reject each others Arguments for Prelacy, and are so very unhappily situated, that they can't possibly Defend against Popery but upon Presbyterian Principles, nor Impugn Presbytry but upon Popish ones. I hope then the Reader will easily Pardon me that

VI. The PREFACE.

I have run out into such a Length when my Subject and Design was so large.

AS for that which is called STYLE, I have taken just as much care about it as was needfull to make my Self understood. Any further Niceness I judged Superfluous upon a Subject of this Nature, which I suspect is not very capable of Dress, unless one intend a Harangue instead of a Dispute.

Ornare Res ipsa negat, contenta Doceri.

My greatest care, next to that of the Matter, was that I shou'd not be Intricate or Perplexed, as Controversies are apt to be: And this I hope I have obtain'd: For I have never made any Blind References to Mr. Rhind's Book; but have always given His Sense, and almost always in His own Words, which is another considerable cause that my Book is so large.

TO both which I may add a Third viz. That I have inserted some few Digressions, tho' not I hope from the Purpose, yet from the Thread of Mr. Rhind's Book. That upon the late Vindication of the Fundamental Charter of Presbytry, which the Reader will find p. 32, is but short: And, tho' one wou'd think that Scots Men ought to be very little concern'd with the English Liturgy, yet that being the Dispute of the Day, I understand that the Author of the Country-Man's Letter to the Curate, against which that Vindication is directed, intends, if GOD spare Him, a Second Edition, in one Volume on a fine Paper and Type, both of the Dialogues concerning the English Liturgy, and of that Letter &c; wherein the Subject of the Liturgy is to be more largely Discoursed, and whatever has been advanced against the Dialogues by Mr. Barclay or others, and against the Letter by the Vindicator, either in Reason or History, is to be consider'd. The largest Digression I have made, which the Reader will find p. 317. is that on the Earl of Cromerty's late Book. Besides that it was necessary in Point of Self Defence, I persuade my Self His Lordship will be pleas'd with it, because

it may help to Exactness in a Piece of History, which His Lordship has so much contributed to the Inlightning of.

AS to the Conduct of the whole Book, I am sensible how much I shall want the Reader's Indulgence. But this Piece of Justice I crave That He wou'd not Censure any one Part of it, till He have read through the whole; because what He might perhaps expect to find in one Place, I may have possibly thought fit to reserve to Another, where I fancied it might stand to greater Purpose or with a better Grace. Further, I must advertise the Reader, that, having used the Word WHIG in some few Places, I meant it in the Original Scotch Sense, as signifying a Presbyterian, except when by the Context it appears, that it is to be understood in that more Comprehensive Notion Use has now affix'd to it.

I hope the Reader will be Mercifull as to the Errors in Printing. Such as are of any Moment are but few; and both these and the lesser Escapes in Spelling, Pointing, or Dividing of Syllables I expect will be Excused upon the Account of My Distance and necessary Absence from the Press.

AFTER all I have said p. 15. there are some wou'd still persuade me that not Mr. Rhind, but another Person of a much higher Character is the true Author of the APOLOGY. But 'tis the same Thing to me whether it be so or otherwise: For I never thought that External Character cou'd either heighten or diminish the Intrinsick Value of a Book: Nor did I intend a Dispute against any Man's Person, but, tho' I ordinarily name Mr. Rhind only, yet I generally mean His Party: And therefore, tho' He complains that the Presbyterians have exhausted all their Common Places of Slander against Him, yet for my own Part, I have consider'd Him meerly as the Writer of the APOLOGY, without so much as touching upon His Personal Qualities or Circumstances in any Private Concern. I knew the Publick cou'd have been very little Edified with Personal

VIII. The P R E F A C E.

Objections; and I did not think I wanted such Adminicles, the Argument it self having given me sufficient Advantage.

PLAINLY, I persuade my self that every one who has read Mr. Rhind's Book will, upon the Reading of mine, allow that I have kept more Temper than perhaps was due to such a Piece. For, when a Set of People, about whom there is nothing Extraordinarily Christian appearing, will needs put such a Jest upon Mankind, as to Monopolize the Name of CHURCH to themselves, and Belch out their Fire and Venom, without Fear or Wit, against the whole Reformed Interest, and yet at the same Time will have us to believe 'em Protestants; In such a Case I must needs own, that

Difficile est Satyram non Scribere,---

However, I have restrain'd my self as much as the Matter cou'd admit of, or either Justice or Charity required.

I reckon upon it that my Book will be answered; and 'tis hardly possible to foresee what kind of Arguments may be used against me; But there is one which I deprecate viz. that Powerfull one --- Damn me. I don't fear that any of their Laity will attack me with it, I have a better Opinion of their Piety and Manners; but I dare not promise so much on their Clergy's Head: For, what has been, † may be. However, by Way of Prevention, I own it to be an unanswerable Kind of Argument; And therefore they may save themselves the Trouble of it; so much the rather that they cannot be very great Losers, tho' they omit it.

BUT I am sensible that by the Length of this Preface I add to the Transgression of the Book. After all I can say, I know it must, as all other Books have ever done, take its Fate according to the

the Inclination or Capacity of its Different Readers. And therefore, as it is, I send it forth into the World with its Father's Blessing, heartily praying that the GOD of Truth and Peace may Prosper It to the Preserving among us Two such valuable Enjoyments.

March 17th,

1714.

E R R A T A.

Page 9. Line 13. Read *that* flat: Ib. L. 15. r. I have heard. P. 13. L. 1. r. be so very. Ib. L. 13. r. crudely. Ib. L. 19. are one r. are on, and so in some other Places. P. 33. L. 21. r. Retradations. P. 42. L. 20. r. Loser. P. 43. L. 22. *Presbytries* r. Presbyters. P. 44. L. 8. two r. too. P. 45. L. 14. *Principal*. r. Principle. P. 48. L. 6. from the Form the Rules. r. from the Rules. Ib. L. 27. *is* examined. r. *are* examined. P. 64. L. 22. *Priest* r. *Priests*. P. 70. L. 20. r. revile. P. 71. L. 27. r. Necks. P. 72. L. 11. r. Eutropius. P. 76. L. 22. *his* Concession r. *this* Concession. P. 81. L. 31. *Agis* 10. r. *Agis*. 19. P. 86. L. 14. *hear* r. here. P. 112. the Word *Seven* in the End of the 2d Line is to be blotted out. P. 117. L. 28. *Marital* r. Marital. P. 118. L. 1. He had. dele He. P. 120. L. 10. *Degree* r. Degree. P. 143. L. 20. refers His Readers *to*. dele *to*. P. 149. L. 8. His Words. r. His Words *are*. P. 175. L. 10. *on* Day. r. *one* Day. P. 176. L. 13. furnishing out of. dele. cf Ib. L. 23. Year 1642. r. 1542. P. 188. L. 16. *Redicula* r. *Ridicula*. P. 227. L. 8. is Nothing dele the Point. P. 319. L. last. *Worfe* r. *Worsh*.

C O R R I G E N D A I N M A R G I N E

Page 71. a Capite. *Dele*, a. P. 85. *lege* Secessum. P. 97. *Lege* Vacabam. Ib. *Legislativum*. P. 98. *lege*, tribuendam. P. 120. *lege* quoque. P. 122. *Lege*, Ternis. P. 133. *Lege*, Elegit. P. 148. *Lege* tradidit. P. 164. *Lege*, fonte. P. 175. *Lege*, pepitit. P. 182. *lege*, Obsoleverit. P. 201. *Lege*, non adduct.

c

Mr. Rhind's Apology disproved.

THE INTRODUCTION

THE general Method of Mr. *Rhind's* Book is, I acknowledge, abundantly Distinct. Therein, after the History of the *MANNER* How, He gives an account of the *REASONS* for Which He separated from the *Presbyterian* Party; to wit, because, upon *Enquiry* He found Their *GOVERNMENT* to be Schismatical, Their *Articles* of *FAITH* fundamentally False and Pernicious, Their *WORSHIP* scandalously Corrupt and highly Imperfect, and their *SPIRIT* diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel. A heavy enough Charge truly; and if but one half of it hold True, every good Christian must needs at once Justify his *Separation*, and Congratulate his Escape.

But it is the Design of the following Sheets to *Examine* his Performance; and if in the Issue it shall be found, that there is neither Truth in his *Assertions*, Strength in his *Arguments*, Proof for his *Allegances*, nor Modesty in his *Characters*; Then, I hope, it will follow, that, how much Reason soever some other Party may have to be fond of their new Profelyt, yet the *Presbyterians* have no such Cause to be swallowed up of overmuch Sorrow for their Loss, but that they may hope the Days of their Mourning may wear over, and they may be comforted.

C H A P. I.

Containing preliminary Remarks.

THough his *Title, Preface and Narrative* have no great Influence on the main Subject; yet, that I may proceed in order; for clearing the Ground, I shall beg leave to take them under Review in some few *Remarks*: the rather, because the doing so will, I hope, sufficiently distinguish the Spirit of the *Author*, perhaps too, help to enlighten his Book.

S E C T. I.

Containing Remarks on the Title of Mr. Rhind's Book.

I. **M**R. *Rhind* has given his Book the Title of an *Apology*. But, I apprehend, when the Book it self is lookt into, it will appear to be very ill Chosen. The Apostle *Peter* enjoins (a) *Christians to be always ready to make an Apology* (so it is from the Original) *to every one that asks a Reason of the Hope that is in them.* But, though that Apostle had as much Edge on His Temper, and possibly was as forward in his Zeal as Mr. *Rhind*; though the Cause of *Christianity* was at least of as great Importance as that of *Prelacy*, and the Enemies the Church had then to do with little better natured than the *Presbyterians*; yet He would not allow them, in putting in an *APOLOGY* even for *Christianity* it self, though against *Jews and Pagans*, to use Rudeness or Bitterness, far less Calumny and Slander; but expressly Charges Them to do it with *MEEKNESS* and *FEAR*. Mr. *Rhind* was not Ignorant of this Precept, He has fronted his Book with it; but, since ever *Apologies* were in fashion, I very much doubt if ever any was writ with so unchristian a Spirit, so absolutely void of both these Requisites. I do not believe the

(a) 1 Epist. Chap. 3. 15.

the Reader wou'd think himself much gratified by entertaining Him with a Collection of all the Passages in the *Apology* that might contribute to prove this Character I have given of it: Yet 'tis necessary I produce *One*, lest any should suspect I charge Him falsely. And *one*, I'm perswaded, will be fully sufficient for that Purpose. I shall therefore, without adding, altering or diminishing, transcribe one Paragraph from Him, wherein He has drawn the Character of the *Presbyterians*, distinguish'd too into its Periods for the Readers more distinct conception. It is thus

1. They (*the Presbyterians*) are naturally Rigid and Severe, and therefore conclude, that God is such a one as themselves. 2. They damn all who differ from them, and therefore think that God does the same. 3. And because They love themselves, They are pleased to perswade Themselves that They are his special Favorites. 4. In a Word, They are Respecters of Persons, and therefore think to Patronize Their Partiality with His Authority. 5. Hence They conclude that They owe them no Civilities whom God neglects, nor kind Offices whom he hates. 6. He neglects and hates all who are not capable of his Grace, which none are (say they) who are not of their Way. 7. This wicked persuasion sanctifies not only the ill Manners, but which is worse, the ill Nature of the Party, towards all who differ from them. It contradicts the Ends of Society and Government, and is only calculated to advance the private Interest of a Partial and Designing Set of Men! Thus He p. 208.

Now, if in all this Paragraph there is the least allay of *Meekness*, He would very much oblige us, if He would tell us what *Bitterness* and *Malice* is.

But though His Zeal swallowed up his *MEEKNESS*, yet, was there no place for *FEAR* (the other Requisite) I mean a Reverence and Regard to Truth? Might he not have thought it Necessary to offer at least at some Instances for supporting the said Character? Did he fancy it would be believed on his bare Word? He must be abundantly sanguine if he did. However, *Presbyterians* don't think themselves much in hazard from Writers that sacrifice their Veracity to the Pleasure of breathing their Spleen. They are accustomed to have the most black Characters drawn of them by the Rampant high Church Authors; But they don't feel themselves

much hurt thereby, because they are as notoriously false as they are Black. 'Tis difficult to name that ill Thing which a *Heylin*, a *Hicks*, a *Lefsky*, a *Sacheverel*, *Calder* or some other very Reverend Divine of the like Probity has not write of Them or imputed to Them.' Who were the Instruments that procured the *Spanish Armado* to invade *England* in 1588? The Whigs (b). Who burnt *London* in 1666? The Whigs (c). Who piloted in and assisted the *Dutch* to burn the *English Fleet* at *Chatham*? The Whigs (d). Nay who crucified *Jesus Christ*? Who but the Whigs, the very Children are taught to lisp out that (e). *Calves Headfeasts* are with these Authors true History, Why? Because one of themselves wrote it, and the rest cite it (f), and who dares doubt it after that?

But suppose it was below an Author of Mr. *Rhind's* Soaring *Genius* to adduce *Proof* for his Assertions, or to regard so small a Circumstance as *Truth* in his Characters; yet might he not have used so much common Prudence, as not to draw the *Presbyterians* in the Habit of High-Church *Tories*, and to Twit them with that whereof Himself and Fellows are notoriously Guilty beyond what was ever heard of among any Party of Christians except the Church of *Rome*? His forecited Character turns mainly upon uncharitableness. The *Presbyterians*, saith he, damn all that differ from them, and therefore think that God does the same. But is not this even the distinguishing Principle of a *High-flyer*? Has not Mr. *Dodwell*, whom Mr. *Rhind* so much admires, and upon whose Principles he professes to have formed his own p. 24, 25. expressly taught, that there is no communicating with the FATHER or the SON but by Communion with the Bishop. 'It is, saith he, one of (g) the most dreadful aggravations of the Condition of the Damn'd, that they are banished from the Presence of the Lord and from the Glory of his Power. The same is their Condition also who are disunited from Christ, by being disunited from his visible Representative (the Bishop). Nay, has he not shut up even the small Cranny of the uncovenanted Mercies of God, which might have let in some faint Ray of Hope, against all the

(b) *Cassandra* Numb. II. p. 57. (c) *New Association* part II. p. 58. (d) *Ibid.* (e) *Calder* on the Sign of the Cross, Numb. VIII. p. 32. (f) *Cassandra* Numb. I. p. 46. [g] *One Priesthood*, Chap. XIII. p. 14.

the World but *Episcopalians* alone, by declaring in that same Place, 'That it is *extreamly* uncertain, and at least *infinitely* hazardous (and what can be beyond *Infinite*?) that ever they shall share in them. Do not Scores of their other Authors talk at the same Rate? But why do I speak of others? Is not this the very Design of Mr. Rhind's Book? Was not that the Reason why he *separated* from the *Presbyterians*, because *They are not in the Ordinary Road to Heaven* p. 31? Nay I hope to make it good to every Man's Conviction ere I have done, that he has damned the whole Christian Churches on Earth, the Church of *England* her self too among the Rest excepting some *High-flyers*, who can no more be said to be of the Church, than an overgrown Wen or some monstrous Tumour on the Body can be called a Part of it. Think now how well calculate Mr. Rhind's Book is to bear the Title of an *Apology*; how wisely and justly his Meek and Catholick Spirit charges the *Presbyterians* with *Rigour* and *Uncharitableness*. I wou'd advise him, if ever his Book come to a *Second Edition*, to alter the Title a litle, and instead of an APOLOGY to call it a LYBELL.

II. In his Title he promises to give an Account of the Reasons for which he separated from the *Presbyterian Party*, AND EMBRACED THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH. I cannot but wish he had been a litle more particular, and told us OF WHAT CHURCH. 'Tis true, the Church is but one; yet there are several *Communities*. There is the *Roman*, the *Lutheran*, the Church of *England* *Communion*, with too many others, which differ from each other in very considerable Points; But though I have read his Book with all the Application I was Capable of; I sincerely declare I cannot find out that Church, whose *Communion* he can reasonably claim to.

The *Presbyterian Party* is that which he hath abandon'd. He hath, though indeed in very modest Terms, disclaimed the *Communion* of the Church of *Rome* p. 14. 15. The *Greek*, *Armenian*, *Ethiopick* Churches &c lay too far out of his Road. The lesser Fractions and Sects among Christians he gave not himself the Trouble to enquire about, from a just Fear lest if he had, He had ended His Days, ere He had formed His Confession of Faith p. 14. What Church then can it be whose *Communion* he has embraced?

He

He has given us *three* hints to find her out by, but none of them sufficient to give Light in the Matter and determine the Enquiry.

I. He tells us p. 28 *It is the Communion of the Catholick Church.* But this *CATHOLICK* is a Hackney which every Party press into their Service, every Church claims, and the Church of *Rome*, which yet he disowns, appropriates to her Self. And so we are just as Wise as we were.

II. He tells us in the Beginning of his *Preface*, that it is the Communion of the *SUFFERING CHURCH*, by which he means the *Prelatists* in *Scotland*. But, though he hath joined himself to them, yet that he is not of them, nor within their Communion, I shall, ere I go further, make abundantly Evident upon this single *Postulatum*, that that *CHURCH* is the same in her *Principles* now, she is *Suffering*, that She was while *Flourishing*.

She was while *Flourishing* *Erastian* in her *Government*, *Calvinist* in her *Doctrine*, her *Worship* without a *Liturgy*, her *Discipline* exercised by *Lay Elders*. All which is directly Contrary to the Principles of Mr. *Rhind's* Book.

First, I say, His *Suffering Church* was *Erastian* in her *Government*. Besides the Tract of our History and many Acts of Parliament, Arch-Bishop *Gladstones* has given Emphatick Testimony that it was so in the Time of King *James VI*. In his Letter to that Prince of the Date *August 31. 1612*. He has these remarkable Words. 'For, besides that no Estate may say, that they are your Majesties Creatures, as we may; so there is none whose standing is so slippery, when your Majesty shall frown, as We. For at your Majesties Nod we must either stand or fall. Thus also it was in the late Times after the Restauration of King *Charles II*, as appears by the Act of Parliament Redintegrating the Estate of Bishops: For therein 'the Disposall of the External Government and Policy of the Church was declared to be in his Majesty and his Successors as an inherent Right of the Crown, and that they might settle, enact and limit such Constitutions, Acts and Orders concerning the Administration of the External Government of the Church, and the Persons employed in the same, and concerning all Ecclesiastical Meetings, and Matters to be proposed and determin'd there-

‘in, as they, in their Royal Wisdom, shall think fit. Did she alter this Principle upon the *Revolution*? No. In the Year 1692, no fewer than 180 of the *Episcopal* Clergy with Dr. *Canaries* on their Head, in their own Name and in that of the whole Body of the *Episcopal* Clergy in the *North*, addressed the General Assembly to be assumed into Ministerial Communion and a Share of the Church-Government upon a *Formula* whereof the First Words are. *I A. B.* ‘do sincerely declare and promise, that I will submit to the *Presbyterian* Government of the Church as it is now established in this Kingdom---. This they could not, without exposing themselves to Damnation, have promised to do, had they judged *Presbyterian* Government to be *Schismatical*; But their Doing so was very well consistent with the *Erastian* Principles. Now Mr. *Rhinds* Principles are directly opposite to these: For he hath not only taught, ‘That ‘the Church is a Society independent upon the State, P. 29. but that *Prelacy* is the only Government of the Church by Divine Right, and that exclusive of all others. This is the avowed Design of almost one half of his Book.

Secondly, His *suffering* Church was *Calvinist* in point of *Doctrine*. *Knox's* Confession of Faith was formed in the Year 1560; exhibited to and ratified by the Parliament that same Year and oftentimes afterward. It was owned as the only Confession of this Church, without Rival without Controul either by *Prelatists* or *Presbyterians* for almost *sixty Years*. I need not tell any Body who has seen it, that it was *Calvinist* all over. In the Year 1616. the General Assembly at *Aberdeen*, wherein Arch-Bishop *Spotswood* was Moderator, formed a new Confession of Faith, which we have at length in *Calderwood's* History from P. 638. This was yet more expressly and rigidly *Calvinist* than the other. In the late *Episcopal* Times, *Knox's* Confession of Faith was again revived and sworn to in the Oath of the *Test*. The whole *Episcopal* Clergy, except some few that were *Whiggishly* inclin'd and refused it on other Accounts, went into that Oath: And therein not only ‘declared that they believed the said Confession to be founded on, ‘and agreeable to the written Word of God; but also promised and ‘swore to adhere thereto during all the Days of their Life-time, *yea* ‘and to endeavour to educate their Children therein. After the *Revolution* the *Westminster* Confession of Faith was ratified and esta-
 blished

blished as the avowed Confession of this Church. How much *Calvinist* that is every one knows. Yet in the Year 1692, the *Episcopal* Clergy, who desired to be assumed upon the *Formula* before mentioned, promised 'that they would subscribe the said Confession of Faith and larger and shorter Catechism confirmed by Act of Parliament, as containing the Doctrine of the Protestant Religion professed in this Kingdom. This Promise, if it signified any more than a Juggle, which we ought never to suppose a Clergy Man guilty of, could import no less, than that they own'd the Doctrine of the Said *Confession* and *Catechisms* to be true, at least, that they did not judge them to be *fundamentally False and Pernicious*. This is a short History of all the *Confessions of Faith* were ever received in *Scotland* since the Reformation. All of them were formed upon the *Calvinistick* Scheme, all of them have been assented to by the *Episcopal* Clergy; yet all of them directly contrary to Mr. *Rhind's* Book in the Doctrine of the Decrees, Predestination, Perseverance, universal Redemption, universal Grace &c.

Thirdly, His *suffering* Church had her *Worship* without a *Liturgie*. *Knox's* Liturgie was falling into Desuetude ere *Episcopacy* was established in the Time of King *James VI*. Besides, Ministers were never bound to the constant Observance of it. On the contrary, the Book it self allows them to use the several Forms, or *THE LIKE IN EFFECT*. And, saith one of its Rubricks, 'It shall not be necessary for the Minister daily to repeat all these Things before Mentioned, but beginning with some manner of Confession to proceed to the Sermon; which being ended, he either useth the Prayer for all Estates before mentioned, or else prayeth as the Spirit of God shall move his Heart, framing the same according to the Time, and Matter which he hath entertained of----.' 'Tis true there was an Attempt made in the Time of *K. Charles I*. to bring in a *Liturgie* much after the *English* Model. But I need not tell the World, that it miscaried. No wonder: For, not only the Body of the Nation and the Bulk of the *Presbyters*, but even the Wisest and most experienced of the *Bishops* were against it. This, *Gilbert Burnet* has Ingenuously confessed (*b*). This the Author of the *Short Account of Scotland*, though

Episco-

Episcopal, frankly owns page 56. ' It was set on Foot by a Foreigner (*A. B. Laud*) upon the Importunity of some young Bishops in the Kirk of Scotland, who made it their Business, to oppose the Ancients and thought it Matter of Triumph to carry any Point against them. Thus he. In the late Times before the *Revolution*, the *Episcopal* Clergy did not so much as Essay to bring in a *Liturgie*. For many Years after the *Revolution* none of them publicly used any either in their Churches or Meeting-houses. And to this Day some of the best of them, to my certain Knowledge, are against the *English* Liturgie. How then can Mr. *Rhind* pretend to be of their Communion, when he argues not only for the *Excellency*, but even the *Necessity* of Forms; and declares that Flat Impertinencies, substantial Nonsense and horrid Blasphemies are *UNAVOIDABLE* in the Extemporary Way †. And yet I heard the *Extemporary* Prayers of *Episcopal* Ministers five Hunder Times. It seems I have been well employed. And I have known five hunder People harrassed in the late Times for not going to Church to hear such Prayers. It seems it was a mercifull Government that persecuted People for not putting themselves under the *unavoidable* Necessity of hearing horrid Blasphemies by way of Address to God Almighty.

Fourthly, His *Suffering* Church exercised her *Discipline* by *Lay Elders*; and this every one knows that lived before the *Revolution*. I conclude then that Mr. *Rhind* is not of the Communion of the *Suffering* Church either in point of *Government*, *Faith*, *Worship* or *Discipline*, unless he can prove that she hath changed her Principles in all these within a Score of Years or so; which I suppose it will be hard for him to do. And when he has done it, I cannot think it will contribute much to the raising her Character to represent her as a *CHANGELING*.

Let us go on in our Search after his Church. He gives us a *Third* Hint for finding her, by telling us p. 169. ' That he has embraced the Communion of that Church whose Worship is the best in the World with Respect to both Matter and Manner. By which Character he would have us to understand the Church of

B

England.

England. But, though he has embraced her, yet she is so far from embracing him, that he stands *DE FACTO* Excommunicated by her. I shall have ample Occasion to shew this when I come to consider his second Reason for his *Separation*. In the mean Time, to satisfy the Reader's Longing, I shall give one Instance for Proof of it. Among the other *Presbyterian* Doctrines which he has declared *Fundamentally False and Pernicious* &c. he reckons this as one, *That the best Actions of Men, without Grace, are but so many splendid Sins*†. The Truth of this *Presbyterian* Doctrine is obvious even to common Sense: For, how busie soever a Servant may be, yet if he has no Regard to the Will of his Master in what he does, can his Diligence be reckoned Obedience? Nay, must not the neglect of his Masters Authority be imputed to him as a Fault? But, it is not the Truth of the Doctrine I am now concerned about. Be it true or false, is it not the Doctrine of the Church of *England* as much as of the *Presbyterians*? Hear her.

Art. XIII.

‘ **WORKS** done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God; For as much as they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make Men meet to receive Grace or (as the School Authors say) deserve Grace of *Congruity*: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath commanded and willed them to be done, We doubt not but that they have the Nature of Sin.

’Tis plain then that he has impugned and rejected the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. Now let us hear what Censure she has awarded to such as do so.

Canon V. 1603.

‘ **WHO**soever shall hereafter affirm That any of the XXXIX Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces and whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at
‘ *London*

' *London* in the Year of our Lord 1562 for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the Establishing of Consent touching True Religion, are in any Part Superstitious or Erroneous, or such as he may not with a *Good Conscience* subscribe unto; let him be Excommunicated *IPSO FACTO.*, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his Repentance and publick Revocation of such his Wicked Errors.

Who now will say that Mr. *Rhind* is of the Church of *England* Communion, when she has excommunicated him. I conclude then upon the whole, That it is not possible to find that Church wherein he can be classed, I mean, here on Earth. As for the *UN-SPOTTED* Church † of which the late *Edinburgh* Addressers professed themselves to be, I don't believe it to be on this side the Clouds.

SECT. II.

Containing Remarks on Mr. Rhind's Preface.

OUR *Apologist* is earnest to have his Reader believe that it was not upon any sinful Byas or Wordly Consideration that he changed Sides. And therefore in the Beginning of his Preface tells us, ' That a forcible Conviction, which was the Result of an Impartial Enquiry, determin'd him to abandon the Presbyterian Party *SOME YEARS AGO* when the Church was under severe Pressures in this Nation and when there were small hopes of Deliverance. But, he has been too General in the Date of his Conversion, and some People are tempted to think there was a Reason for it. Her Majesty was pleased *SOME YEARS AGO* to write a Gracious Letter to her Privy Council of *Scotland* of the Date Feb. 4. 1703. in favours of the *Episcopal* Clergy and others of that Profession. Her Majesty was so far from intending that the said Letter should have any ill Influence on the *Presbyterian* Establishment, that on the Contrary she recommended it to Her

B 2

Council

Council to give them all Due Countenance and Encouragement. Yet it is abundantly well known in this Nation, That the *Episcopal* Party constructed the said Letter as a Preface to the overturning of *Presbytry* and the Reestablishment of *Prelacy*; As if her Majesty, like a kind Mother teased with hungry Children, had bid them content themselves a little with that Morsel, till she could get Dinner provided for them. And, in Opposition to all her Majesties Promises and Assurances to the Contrary, the Distinction betwixt a *Secret* and *Revealed* Will was industriously propagated. And from that Time some young Divines, who hitherto had been warmed and Fledged, under the Wings of *Presbytry*, began to look with a more kindly Eye towards the *Prelatick* Party, and to alter their Conduct accordingly. If Mr. *Rhind's* Separation was prior to that Time, there is the more Charity to be had for him, and he was not Kind enough to himself in not signifying so much. But if it was *after* it, I can see nothing Extraordinary in it: For, to run from under a falling House, and to Worship the rising Sun, is what People do every Day.

Besides, how little Encouragement soever Mr. *Rhind* might hope for from the *SUFFERING* Church in *Scotland*, yet he might very reasonably, upon his revolt, expect more elsewhere than ever he could have found among the *Presbyterians*. A *Presbyterian* Minister is like the Heath in the Wilderness that never grows higher. When once he has got himself possessed of a Church, however shining his Parts are, there is a *ne plus ultra* set to his Ambition. But in the *Prelatick* Way there are various Degrees of *Dignity* to animate the generous Spirit. 'Tis possible one may Rise from a *Curat* to a *Rector* from thence to a *Dear*, *Archdeacon* or so, at length obtain a *Mitre*, and never cease advancing till he hath lodged himself in *Lambeth*. Though I will not suppose Mr. *Rhind* so airy as ever to have Dreamed of mounting the highest Pinnacle of Honour; yet had he so humble an Opinion of himself as not to allow himself to think that he might one Day merit some of the *greater* Church *Dignities*? Was it no Motive to him to know that there are People in the World much fonder of a *Protelyt* from *Presbytry* than from *Paganism*. And that the writing of an *Apology* might very much contribute to his Advancement? He does not seem to

to be ¹⁰very much a Stranger to good Authors, as not to have heard of *Juvenal's* Secret for rising in the World.

*Wear'st thou to Honours and Preferments Climb,
Be bold in Mischief, dare some mighty Crime.*

Mr. Dryden sat. 1. 1. 73.

And is not Dr. *Sachewerel* a Fresh Instance of the Wisdom of that Precept, whose *high Misdemeanours* made him at once the Idol and Darling of high Church, the Theam of her Praise, and Object of her Bounty.

II. He has been pleased in his Preface to give his own favourable Judgement of his Performance, of the Plainness of his Style and Thought, the Linking of his Arguments and so on. And I think it cannot be amiss to give mine too, before I enter on the Book it self. Besides the *ill Nature* (already noticed) which bewrays it self almost in every Page, and is sometimes continued through many, without so much as one Ray of Truth to qualifie it. Besides this, I say, his Book bears Three other Characters, none of the most lovely indeed yet too Remarkable to escape Notice. I mean, *Vanity, Dogmaticalness and Prophaness.*

1. *Vanity.* With a very distinguishing Air he assures the Reader † That he meant something else by the length of his Narrative than to add to the Number of his Pages. This was so necessary an *Innuendo*, so pretty a Phrase, that he thought fit to repeat it again in his own Favours p. 79. He had before told, in his printed Sermon on *Liturgie*, That his *Genius and the Course of his Studies* had habituated him to some Application of Thought. This was of so great Moment to be known, perhaps so hard to be gathered from his Writings, that he now tells it over again in his *Apology* p. 159. Again p. 199 he dispenses with himself from writing a *Lecture on the Animal Oeconomy* and accounting *Mechanically* for all the Phenomena of the *Presbyterian Devotion*, because he wants *Leisure*. No doubt. Yet some People think it had been not only as *Modest*, but as *True* an Excuse to have said he wanted *Ability*. In the mean Time

he is not so just as to own that what he has already advanced on that Head he owes to Dr. Scot in his Sermon on *Bodily Exercise* from 1 Tim. 4. 8. and other Places of his Works.

2. *Dogmaticalness*. He writes with the same Positive Air as if he were infallible. Every thing adduced on the Presbyterian Side is with him *Weakness, Prejudice*, an Argument of a *Desperate Cause* and the like. What he himself advances, is put beyond all Doubt, and he hopes *Every discerning and unprejudiced Reader will take the Hint, and be convinced as well as he*. Nay it shall be an *Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom* to think differently from him. Nay our Lord himself behoved to do according to Mr. Rhind's Dictates. Repeated Instances of this Presumption we shall meet with afterwards. The most Learned of the *Arminian* Side in the Church of *England* have owned, that the *Calvinists* have to say for their Opinions on the Controverted Points, what is not to be easily answered. But there is nothing too hard for Mr. Rhind. *Conditional Decrees, Freewill, the Apostacy of the Saints, Universal Redemption, Universal Grace* are all as clear to him as Self-evident Propositions. Nay, so strong has his Fancy wrought; that, as if he had for ever decided the *Episcopal, Arminian, and Liturgical* Controversies, He concludes his Book in the Mathematical Stile with a Q. E. D.

3. *Profaness*. He sets himself industriously from pag. 189. to pag. 207. to put the most sacred Things in the most Burlesque Air possible. The *Presbyterians*, saith he, pag. 200, *tell a long but senseless story of the Manner of Gods dealing with the Souls of his Elect, how the Work of Grace is carried on there, and how their Regeneration is completed*.--- 'Tis true, the *Presbyterians* do talk of these Things; but how long and senseless soever the Story is, the Substance of it is what every good Man feels; 'Tis what the Spirit of God works; 'Tis a Story which the Church of *England* Divines, the most judicious of them (*i*), Bishops too among the Rest, have told a thousand times over, and some of them very lately (*k*). I am not to repeat the rest of his impious Stuff vomited out on that Head; once printing it was too much. I only wish that our *Prelatical* Writers, tho' they don't regard Man, yet would

24

[i] See Hooker's Sermons subjoined to his Eccles. Polit. Edit. London 1705. [k] Bishop Hopkins, Dr. Edwards, &c.

at least fear God. For I suppose that no Man that reads the latter Part of Mr. *Rhind's* Book will stick to acknowledge that *Lucian, Celsus, Vaninus, Spinosa, Blount*, may be reckoned modest Christians in Comparison of him.

III. Towards the End of the *Preface*, Mr. *Rhind*, apprehending some one or other might essay to disprove his *Apology*, thinks fit to bespeak civil Usage for himself; with Certification, that in Case he is not thus used, *He will expose the Presbyterians yet more fully to the World*. Were I of his Council, I wou'd advise him, ere he proceed further, once to prove the Characters whereby he has already attempted to expose them, lest he establish a Character upon himself and the Party He serves that will be none of the most honourable. Nor let him fear it will be reckoned Pedantry to studd his Margin with Vouchers: For I can assure him, the World is now so much Infidel, *Whigs* especially, as not much to regard Assertion without Probation. If the *Presbyterians* are such as he has represented them, he cannot expect civil Usage from them. And if they are not such, he may be sensible he has not deserved it. However, to make him easy, I shall promise him all fair Quarter, and resent his Invectives no otherwise than by Neglect: Or if I chance at any Time to draw his Picture, it shall be with Canvass and Colours of his own furnishing.

IV. I am now to enter on the Book it self. I have heard it both from *Prelatists* and *Presbyterians*, that it was not done by Mr. *Rhind* himself, but that his *Separation* haveing given the Occasion, a better Hand than his did the Work, and borrowed his Name to it. The *Prelatists* possibly give out this to gain the greater Reputation to the Performance. But ifso, 'tis a very mean Politick: For, by how much it magnifies the Book, it disgraces the Man, and at once lessens their own Trophy and the *Presbyterian's* Loss. The *Presbyterians* found on this, that while he attended his Studies among them, tho' his Zeal against the *Prelats* was flaming high, yet his other Accomplishments did not seem proportional. In a Word, That he did not make such a Figure as promised an Author. But this Conjecture also is too weak. For Years and Application do oftimes make surprizing Changes on Young Persons. I do indeed believe that the Book was written at the Desire, and published upon the Approbation of the
Leaders

Leaders of the Party. But I as firmly believe Mr. Rhind to be the true Father; and seeing he owns the Book and none else claims it, I can see no Reason why any Body should believe otherwise. I am so much convinced it is his, that I take the whole Book to be pieced up of *Sermons*, he had preached at several Occasions, or at least of large Shreds of them artfully tacked together. Some such *Sermons* were necessary to ingratiate him with his new *Masters*, his *haranguing* Way seems rather adapted for *Sermons* (according to the *Episcopal* Way of Sermonizing) than for a Dispute. And which confirms all, I find a good Part of his *Sermon upon Liturgie*, which he preached and printed in the Year 1711 engrossed *verbatim* into his *Apology*, tho' he has not acquainted his Reader therewith.

SECT. III.

Containing Remarks on Mr Rhinds Narrative of the Manner how He separated from the Presbyterian Party. From P. 1. to P. 29.

THE Sum of his *Narrative* is, That he was educated *Presbyterian*, turned *Scotick* upon Choice, that he might find out the Truth; the Result of which was that he *separated* upon Conviction. He has indeed gone far to scarr one from Quarrelling the Account he has given, by promising p. 6. to deliver the same with as much Sincerity as shall be these Words with which he hopes to commend his Soul at last to God. And yet I must needs declare, I do not find My Self obliged even in Charity, much less in Justice to believe it. I cannot help thinking it is a Piece of Poesie rather than History, a handsome Fiction of the Method he thinks he ought to have taken, rather than a real Account of what in Fact he did take. I am aware how hardly this my Judgement may be construed of. But I crave to be heard, and then let the Reader give Sentence.

By Mr. Rhind's own Account p. 6. He was educated *Presbyterian*.
When

When he had run through the ordinary Course of the *Languages* and *Philosophy* and commenced *Master of Arts*, He applyed himself, to the Study of *Divinity*. After several Years Attendance on that, he went home to his own Country the Shire of *Ross* to undergo Trials in Order to be licens'd a Preacher.

All this while he was so far from being suspected to incline to *Prelacy*, that he received particular Favours from the *Presbyterians*, as he himself owns p. 7. And as he was not suspected, so indeed there was no apparent Reason why he should: For he owns p. 8. not only that he was really *Presbyterian* in his Judgment, but that he was a Zealot in that Way.

By all this Account we find him at least 21 Years of Age Compleat: For no sooner do the *Presbyterians* admit Men to be Preachers, or enter Them on *Tryals* for that End. And yet all this Time he had not entertain'd a Thought of *Separating*; nay he had not brought his Mind to a Suspence or *Equilibrium* about the Controversy: For, how could he essay to Commence Preacher amongst the *Presbyterians*, while he was undetermin'd to the one Side or the other?

Again he tells us p. 152 that he was but 22 Years among the *Presbyterians*. There is then but *one* Year left for doing all these Things, and making all these Enquiries he mentions in his *Narrative*, and at last determining himself. But if he did 'em all in *one* Year, I dare be bold to pronounce it was a Miracle: Being well assured it would have employ'd any ordinary Man *seven*. A short abstract of his *Narrative* will sufficiently demonstrate this.

1. When the *Luckie Minute* was come that was to give a Beginning to his Conversion, he conceived a very just Suspicion that the many Opinions, wherewith he found his Mind crowded, were not all either well come by or right founded. From this he concluded, that therefore it was reasonable if not necessary to examine and bring them to the Test. But in order to this *Prejudices were to be shaken off*. p. 9. 10. Every Body that has a competent Knowledge of himself will allow that this was not to be done without Time.

2. Thus prepared, He made the first Experiment in some *Philosophical* Points. And, after a *most Impartial* and *Accurat Examination*

nation found, That what formerly he had admitted upon a supposed scientifick Evidence was in it self absolutely False p. 11.

Every one will own that this was not to be done at a Start.

3. Thence he proceeded to try whether his *Religious* Opinions were not as ill founded as his *Philosophical* ones. For that End he threw himself into a State of absolute *Scepticism*, and found that he had yeilded too Implicite an Assent to them. p. 12. Supposing this had been Lawfull, yet, I hope, it will be granted it was not the Work of a Day.

4. After all this Labour to unhinge himself, he next began to search where he might fix. To that Purpose he entered upon the most *Impartial* and *Accurat* Examination of the *Essential* Articles of Religion he was able to make; and ceased not till he was *rationaly* perswaded about the Truth of a *Natural* Religion. p. 13. This, considering how many fine Books have been writ on that Subject, and how many shrewd Things have been advanced against it by such as are called the *Wits* of the World, and, which Mr. *Rhinda's* curious *Genius* would undoubtedly engage him to peruse, wou'd be sufficient to exercise him a very considerable Time.

5. He next carried his Enquiries to *revealed* Religion; and examin'd the *necessity* of Revelation, the *certainty* of that which is owned as such by Christians, in a Word the *Truth* of the *Christian* Religion, and the *Divinity* of the Holy Scriptures. *Ibid.* What a large Subject of Disquisition this is, and how much Time it wou'd require may be easily conjectured.

6. When he had got himself convinced of the Truth of the *Christian* Religion, his Labour was but beginning: For Christians being multiplied into so many Sects, which of them could he believe in the Right, when each of them pretended to be so? He resolv'd then only to examine the Pretensions of the most considerable Parties *viz.* The *Roman* Catholicks and *Protestants*. For that End he laid aside all Prejudices and seriously examin'd all that is commonly adduced for or against the *Roman* Catholick Way. p. 14. 15. Now, who knows not, that the *Popish* Controversies are so very large a Field, as to require several years Travel to get through them to Purpose?

7. He parted Ways with this Intalible Church; though upon a very

very small Quarrel, as we shall hear afterward. But then he found the *Protestants* canton'd into so many Parties, that he was in a great Quandary where to *find rest for the Sole of his Foot*. Wherefore, to shorten his Work, he resolv'd to confine his Examination to the *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian* Perswasions. And here it cost him both Time and Pains to divest himself of his Prepossessions in favours of *Presbytry*, and to shake of the Prejudices he had contracted or been educate in against *Episcopacy*, and to fortifie his Soul against the Tentations of Persecution and Want in Case he were determin'd to the *Episcopal* Side. p. 16.--- 20.

This being done he enter'd upon a very huge Task.

1. He did read the Old and New Testament all over p. 20. Now though a *Shift* may be made to get through that Book in a short Time, yet it is a large one, and when one applies himself to read it with a View to be determin'd by it in controverted Points, which was Mr. Rhind's Case, He'll find it a considerable Labour.

2. After the Bible, he engag'd himself in reading the Works of the *Fathers*, especially those of the *three* first Ages. In which Course of reading he *narrowly* observ'd *whatever* could serve to determin the Controversies in Hand. p. 21. 22. This was a yet larger task than the Former; for tho' he had never gone beyond the third Age; yet, to get through the Works of *Clemens Romanus*, *Barnabas*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Hermas*, *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus*, *Tatianus*, *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Minutius Felix*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, &c. To get through all these I say, with the *Histories* relateing to their Times, was Sufficient to employ one a longer Time than Mr. Rhind's Account can well admit of.

3. And yet he was not near an End of his Toil: For being curious to know *whatever* was written on the Head of Government, he read the Controversists of both sides on *all* the Subjects in Debate. In which, he declares, He was so *scrupulously exact* that he does not remember *any* Author of *any* Name whom he did not peruse except *Salmasius* alone, which he could not come by. p. 22---25. This was to be diligent in good Earnest: For, to read on the *Episcopal* Side *Andrews*, *Bancroft*, *Bilson*, *Burges*, *Chillingworth*,

lingworth, Dounham, Dodwell, Hooker, Hall, Heylin, Hammond, Honeyman, Maurice, Monro, Saravia, Sage, Scot, Sutlivius, Tilen. On the Presbyterian Side Beza, Bain, Bucer, Blondel, Bailie, Cartwright, Calderwood, Clarkson, Gillespie, Forrester, Jamieson, Ratherfoord, Rule, with a long *et cetera* on both sides, to read all these Authors, I say, and to read them so as duely to weigh the Arguments, Objections, Answers, Exceptions and Replys was a *Herculean* Labour. But where is there Time for it by Mr. Rhind's Account? And yet he had not done with it. For

4. As to the other Controversies that relate to *Doctrine, Worship* &c. He consulted the respective Authors *pro* and *con*. p. 26. That is to say, he studied the *Arminian* and *Liturgical* Controversies, which, Every one knows, require both much Time and great Application. Yet after all this he was only shocked, not absolutely determin'd. For

5. To the Study of *Books* he added *Conversation* with learned Men, he collected his Observations on the Spirit and Principles of the Party of which he had so long been; and took Time to inform himself about what he did not know of the other. And narrowly observed how the *Spirit* and *Principles* of both discovered themselves by overt *ACTS*. All this he did, not *once* but *many* Times; and after all this he had his Soul to work up to a due Seriousness and Intention of Thought; and then *once more* recollected what he had learned from Men, Books, or his own Experience *for* or *against* either Principle or Party. Not till this was done, and the Aid and Direction of God invoked, was he determin'd in his Judgment. And even when he was determin'd, Bashfulness or Fear restrained Him, till at last a forcible Conviction and the severe Remonstrances of his Conscience obliged him publickly to declare himself p. 26--29.

This is his Account; but now, how a Man could do all this within the Space of 22 Years, when he had not so much as a Thought of doing any Thing of it at an Age wherein he was capable to be a Preacher, which we cannot suppose earlier than 21; that is, in a Word, how Mr. Rhind could do that in *one* Year, which wou'd have kept any ordinary Man constantly busie *Seven* Years, He has yet to account for to the World. And till it be done, he must excuse his Readers, Me at least, from believing the Sincerity of his Narrative, not

notwithstanding the Solemnity of his Affeuration. And so I proceed in my Remarks.

II. Tho' Mr. Rhind has told us p. 6. *That he owes his Birth to Presbyterian Parents*, yet he has conceal'd his having been baptized by a *Presbyterian Minister*. Did it look like Sincerity to dissemble that which was of so great Moment to be known? I seriously declare I do not intend *Banter or Raillery* by this particular; but touch upon it, because, according to Mr. Rhind's Principles, it is of the last Consequence not only to himself but possibly to many others. He is in a much worse Condition than if he had been baptized by a meer Layman or Midwife in the Church of *England*: For, tho' Baptism as dispensed by them is irregular, yet being Christians, within the Church, and having at least the Connivance of the *Bishop*, it is not *Invalid* and therefore is not repeated, *ordinarily* at least. But *Presbyterian Ministers* are no Christians. They are by his Scheme, not only *without the Church*, but *Enemies* to it. Their Baptism then is null and can have no Effect, even tho' the Person is afterwards confirmed by the *Bishop*: For, what is in its own Nature null can never be made valid by a Posterior Deed: And therefore, as Dr. Hicks informs us (1) the Church has provided the Office for the Baptism of those of riper Years, which was not Originally in the Liturgie, on Purpose to answer the Case of Persons in such Circumstances. This must needs affect Mr. Rhind very heavily: For, according to his own Principles concerning Baptism *, He is no Christian, is without Grace, incapable of Salvation, can neither be Priest nor Deacon, consequently the Baptism dispensed by him to others is Null; Consequently, by his Principles, they must all be Damned if *Extraordinary* Mercy interpose not. I could not think of all this without Horror, and therefore am in Pain till I hear how he extricates himself. By all I can apprehend there is but one Way to save him and prevent further Mischief, viz. to get *Episcopal Baptism*. If he is not convinced of the Necessity of this by what I have said, I recommend to him to read Mr. Laurence's late Book of the *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, where he may have all Objections answered, and both Arguments and an Example to persuade him.

III.

III. Mr. *Rhind* still professes that, while he was among the *Presbyterians*, he was *without the Church* and incapable of Salvation. One would think therefore that he should have ascribed to God the first Hint was given him to make his Escape out of so dangerous a State. Even the Church of *England* Divines themselves who have gone off the *Calvinian Scheme* do yet acknowledge a *preventing Grace*. But does Mr. *Rhind* this? No. He ascribes it to himself and his own Thought; and that, as I take Him, under a favourable *Planetary Aspect*. *When I had arrived, saith he p. 9. at a competent Age, in some lucky minute, my Thoughts suggested to me the reasonableness of my enquiring into my Opinions about Things.* God is not brought into the Account here, Nay he has not so much as a Hint of addressing him by Prayer, till he had DETERMIN'D himself as to *Natural Religion*, till he had got himself perswaded of the Truth of the *Christian Religion*, and till he had resolved himself against the *Romish*. *After all this, and no sooner, did he address the God of all Truth p. 19.* This Conduct of his was design'd and founded upon two Reasons which the Reader may weigh at his Pleasure. First, He is so much an Enemy to *Enthusiasm*, that he did not think it would become him to impute any Motion in his Soul to the Spirit of God: For the *Manner of God's Dealing with the Souls of his Elect is but a senseless Story*, and it was below his Philosophical Genius to ascribe that to a *Divine Efficiency* which might otherwise be accounted for. Secondly, His Story would not have told right, if he should have owned God. For he was resolved to throw himself into a State of *Scepticism*, wherein he was to suspend the Belief of the Being of a God. And in that State it had been very unaccountable to pray to him: *For every one that comes to God, must believe that he is.* It will therefore be very necessary that Mr. *Rhind* in his next explain a little upon the *lucky Minute*, because People are much in the Dark about it.

IV. Mr. *Rhind* p. 7. makes Mention in general of his Obligations to the *Presbyterians*. But did he intend thereby to testify his Gratitude? No. The whole Strain of his Book is Evidence that he had lost all Impressions of that; but he does it, that he may raise his own Character, by shewing, against how great Tentations to the contrary he had separate from *Them*, and upon what Disinterested Views he had come over to the *Episcopal Side*. This is plain from his own Words

Words p. 8. ' And if now that I am none of theirs; and if after having received so many Discourtesies from them, I do still entertain a gratefull Resentment of their Favours, Imagine how deep the Impression must have been, and how much I would be prejudicate in Their behalf, when actually allowed very liberal Expressions of Their Favour and Esteem----- I cannot perswade My Self that such Artifice wou'd become a Man recommending His Soul to God in His last Minutes,

V. I said before That He parted Ways with the Church of Rome upon a very slender Quarrel. What was it? Take it in His own Words p. 15. ' Though I had been convinced of the Truth of all the Articles of Pope Pius's Creed, (which *you may think*, would argue a strong Faith, & a great Deal of Violence offered to my Reason) yet could I never be perswaded, That the Damning of all who did not believe as I did, should be a Condition of My Salvation. In a word, the *absq; qua Fide, &c* which They had made a Term of Communion and an *Article of Their Faith*, was so choaking that it would not believe for Me: And as the Disbelief of this one *Article*, would hinder Their receiving Me, into Their Communion; So indeed, this alone abundantly convinced Me, that I should never enter into it? For understanding this, the Reader must know, that Pope Pius's Creed, after a Rehearsal of the several Articles, hath this affixed, *and the same true Catholick Faith, WITHOUT WHICH NO MAN CAN BE SAVED---I the same N do vow and swear.* This damning Clause was the Quarrel; but I affirm that, supposing he had been convinced of the Truth of all the other Articles, it was no good one; because he has already done the same. The Church of England, to which Mr. Rhind has join'd himself, hath engrossed the *Athanasian Creed* in her *Liturgy*: And yet that Creed has at least *two* such damning Clauses, and in harder Words too; one in the Beginning. ' Who-soever will be saved, before all Things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith, which Faith except every one do keep Holy and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. *Another at the End.* This is the Catholick Faith, which except a Man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.

Why then did He refuse the *Roman Catholick Communion*, for that

that which he has approved of in the Church of *England* Communion? I cannot say it was unwisely done: For, the smaller the *Quarrel* was, the easier may the *Reconciliation* be.

VI. While Mr. *Rhind* is giving an Account of his own Study of the *Fathers*, he falls heavily p. 21 upon the *Presbyterians* for their want of Respect to them. But has he adduced in all his Book one Instance from the Writings of the *Presbyterians* to prove his Charge? Not one. What meant he then? Why he knew that was a *Common-place* for declaiming on among his Party, and it had been a Pity to mis's it. No other Proof has he for his Charge, unless you'll be so kind as to take his own Assertions. *They who had the Directions of my Studies*, saith he, *never recommended to me the reading so much as of one Father*. No wonder truly, it was soon enough to begin the Study of the *Fathers* at the Age of 22. Most part of young Men are not sooner Ripe for it; and at that Age Mr. *Rhind* separated. Bishop *Burnet* is thought to have tolerable good Skill in training young *Theologues*, now hear him (*m*). 'It may seem strange, that in this whole Direction, I have said nothing concerning the Study of the *Fathers* or *Church History*. But I said at first, That a great Distinction was to be made between what was necessary to prepare a Man to be a Priest, and what was Necessary to make him a compleat and learned *Divine*. The knowledge of these Things is necessary to the latter, though they do not seem so necessary for the former: There are many Things to be left to the Prosecution of a *Divines* Study, that therefore are not mentioned here, without any design to disparage that sort of Learning. Thus He. But, proceeds Mr. *Rhind*, *I frequently heard them talk contemptibly of them and their Works, excepting still St. Augustines Books of Predestination and Grace*. That excellent Person Mr. *George Meldrum*, late Professor of *Divinity* at *Edinburgh* was he who had the Direction of Mr. *Rhind's* Studies. If He talked contemptibly of the *Fathers*, I can say from my own personal Knowledge of Him, to be confirmed by many Thousands yet alive; that it was what he hardly ever did of any Body else. Mr. *Rhind* then must prove this ere he is Believed.

But

But while he charges the *Presbyterians* so fiercely on this Head, why does he himself give such a *Contemptible Hint* of *Augustin*? Why p. 114 talks he so *contemptibly* of *Jerom* That he contradicts himself &c? Why, *Augustin* was for the Doctrines of *Predestination* and *Grace*, and *Jerom* for *Presbytry*, both which are Mr. *Rhind's* Aversion; yet one would think he should not deny that Freedom to *Presbyterians* which he takes to himself. The *Presbyterians* willingly acknowledge that the *Fathers* have done excellent Things; yet they don't believe They were infallible. They stick not to say that the *Fathers* were subject to the same Infirmities with other Men, and their Works as full of gross Escapes as these of latter Authors, and that they wrote (as themselves acknowledge) crudely and loosely till Heresies and Schisms arising taught them more Correctness. And do not the Church of *England* Divines talk as *contemptibly* of them as all this, or whatever else *Presbyterians* have said of them can amount to? Yes. Never was there a Set of Writers in the World that treated the *Fathers* more homely and coarsely than they do. The only Difference is, that they fall into this Strain, when they find the *Fathers* to be against Them. But then when they either are *Out*, or can be screwed over to their own Side, Oh then! the *Fathers* are all Oracles, and 'tis the Sin of *Cham* to open a Mouth against Them. Need I cite Instances to prove all this? No. 'Tis clear to every one that's acquaint with their Writings, yet I shall give one or two for satisfying the Reader. One of Mr. *Rhind's* learned Brethren of the Clergy † has lately appeared very loudly in Defence of the Book about *Antichrist* ascribed to *Hippolitus*, though no Man that had not quite prostitute His Sense would have done it. He has been told how *Coke*, *Faulk*, *Whitaker* three famous Divines of the Church of *England* have disparaged it, and how Monsieur *le Fevre* that eminent Critick hath made a Jest of it, and how, supposing it were, what he would have it to be, it yet makes nothing for his Purpose. Yet he, like a true *Teague*, is resolved to keep his Text, whatever he say on it. To put him in Humour then, after so much Wrath, it shall be allowed that *Hippolitus's* Book is Genuine. Now hear

D

with

† Mr. Calder.

with what profound Respect *Jewell* Bishop of *Salisbury* treats (n) the Reverend Father and his Work. 'Tis a very little Book, of *small Price* and as *small Credit*.-- It appeareth it was some *simple Man* that wrote the Book, both for the Phrases of his Speech in the *Greek Tongue*, which commonly are *very Childish*, and also for the *Truth* and *Weight* of the Matter. He beginneth the first Sentence of his Book with *Enim* which a *very Child* would scarcely do. After a Recital of several of his Blunders he adds. And this he saith without either *Warrant* of the *Scriptures*, or *Authority* of the *Church*.-- He alledgeth the *Apocalypse* of *S. John* in the Stead of *Daniel*, which is a Token of *great Ignorance* or of *marvellous Oblivion*. Say now, what Discipline a *Presbyterian* had deserved, had he treated so worthy a Father so familiarly. Take another Instance. Bishop *Whitgift* (o) runs a Comparison 'twixt the *Fathers*, and the *English Bishops* in *Truth of Doctrine*, *Honesty of Life*, and *Right use of External Things*, and very mannerly gives the Preference to himself and his Colleagues in all the three. If these Instances are not sufficient, Mr. *Rhind* may have five hunder moe upon demand, and perhaps some of them ere we have done *. To put an End for ever to this Topick of declaiming against the *Presbyterians*, I here challenge the *Episcopalians* to make a Collection of all the *Contemptible Things* the *Presbyterians* have written of the *Fathers*. And if I do not make as *large* a Collection of as *Contemptible Things* that the *Episcopal Authors* have written of them, it shall be owned they have Reason for their Declamations. If they refuse this, they must give us a Reason why they may make bold with the *Fathers*, and the *Presbyterians* not. Have *Prelatists* only the Priviledge of railing at 'em?

VII. Mr. *Rhind* gives an ample enough Commendation to the Writers of his own Way. I found them all, saith he, p. 23. to be Men of *Discretion and Sense*, so that should I name all whom I thought to have acted their Part handsomly, I should have none unnamed. Is this the *Sincerity* he promised? Could he find never one senseless Author on the *Episcopal Side*? Why certainly he has looked on them with a Lover's Eye; for who is there that knows not, that the Confusion of Languages

Languages at *Babel* was never greater than is among the *Episcopal* Writers? Where shall we find any *two* of them that go entirely upon the same Scheme? Does not every Body know how they mutually reject each others Arguments? Should I instance any of their Writers whom I judge to have performed but so and so, I know I would be declined as a partial Judge; but let us hear one of Themselves giving the Character of his Fellows that went before him. Mr. *Thomas Edwards* asserts (*p*) of them, That as to their Proofs out of Scripture, ' They understood not what they said, nor whereof they affirmed. And in a later Book (*q*) He is so far from repenting of these hard Words, that ' he hopes every Body will grant he had reason for Them. And he would not have this meant of *one* or *two* only of his Fellow Writers, but of the whole Bulk of them. And therefore he pulls down the whole Frame of *Episcopacy* to build it after his own new and better Fashion. Now either M. *Edwards* has not acted his part handsomely, or none of the rest have: For it is sure but a sorry Way of acting, when one knows not what he says, or whereof he affirms.

VIII. Of all the *Episcopal* Authors Mr. *Rhind* gives the Preference to M. *Dodwell* and M. *Sage* †. To the first particularly for his *Book of Schism*, and that of the *One Priesthood and one Altar*; and to the latter for his *Principles of the Cyprianick Age* and the *Vindication* thereof.

That M. *Dodwell* was a Man of vast Reading and Abstract Life every one must acknowledge; but that his Books are of a most pernicious Tendency, I am well perswaded, no one ought to deny. For, in Order to make Room for planting *Prelacy*; He hath, so far as his Principles prevail, not only destroyed Charity, but grubbed up the very Roots of Christianity, yea of Natural Religion. Whether this be an unjust Censure, I refer it to the Reader upon hearing of the following Account.

His Book *against Schism* he published in the Year 1679 When the Civil Government did not want to have a bad Opinion of the *Nonconformists*. Therein he attempts to prove not only that the Separatists from *Episcopal* Government are *Schismatics*, but (*r*) That no Prayers made by themselves, nor by others for them can find Acceptance with God, except such Prayers as are put up for their Con-

D 2

version

[p] Discourt: against Extemporary Prayer. [q] Diocesan Episcopacy proved from Holy Scriptures. p. 231. † p. 24. (r) Chap. XI. Sect. 7.

version from the Schism, and that their Separation is the *Sin unto Death* spoken of by S. John 1 Ep. chap. 5. ver. 16. That, (s) that dreadful Text Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6. *It is impossible for those that were once enlightened* --- is applicable to them. That (t) they are guilty of the same Crime, and as real Enemies to Christ as these who in Terms professed him to be an *Impostor*. That (v) such Separation is a *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, and (x) an Interpretative disowning Christ for our Master. Nay (y) that it is as Criminal as the Sin of the Angels, and the *Old World*, and the *Sodomites*, and the *Israelites* in the Wilderness. In a Word, That nothing is effectual to Salvation without being in the *Episcopal Communion*. I pose now Mr. Rhind to find any thing more impious and scandalous in *Spinosa's Book*, to which, he saies, the *Presbyterians* compare M. *Dodwell's*.

This, one would have thought, was enough for one Man in his whole Life. But M. *Dodwell* did not think so. The Parliament of *England*, considering the great Danger the Nation was in from *Popery*; saw it was necessary to have better Thoughts of the *Dis-senters*, and to give them more Countenance than would have followed upon his Principles. And therefore shortly after the publishing of his Book, viz. upon the tenth of January 1680 the *Commons* declared by their Vote *nemine contradicente*. 'It is the Opinion of this House that the Prosecution of Protestant Dissenters upon the Penal Laws is at this Time grievous to the Subject, a weakening the Protestant Interest, an Encouragement to Popery, and dangerous to the Peace of the Kingdom. This was plainly to blast all Hopes of the Fruits might otherwise have been expected from M. *Dodwell's Book*. Wherefore he makes a *second* Attaque, and in the Year 1683 published his Book of the *One Priesthood, one Altar*, wherein he over again attempted to prove the Nonconformists *Schismatics*, and imagining he had done it, inferrs (z) that they can lay no Claim to the *One Altar* nor to the *One Priesthood*, to the Favour of God here, nor the Enjoyment of him hereafter.

It was no Wonder he was thus severe upon the *Dissenters*: For he proceeded, and made the Church of *England* herself upon the *Revolutions*

[s] Chap. XIII. [t] Ibid. Sect. 13 [v] Chap. XIY. [x] Ibid. Sect. 20. [y] Ibid. Sect. 22. [z] Chap. XIII. Sect. 9, 12, 13, 14.

olution Establishment *Schismatical*, and in the Year 1704 published his *Latine* Book entitled *Parænesis ad exteros de nupero Schismate Anglicano* to advertise Forreigners thereof. What, you'll say, was his Quarrel with the *Revolution* Church of *England*? Was it her Injuries to the late K. *James*? No. Was it her renouncing the Doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance *on any Pretence whatsoever*? No. Was it the scandalous new Prayers she had put into the *Liturgie*? No. All these Things, he expressly tells us p. 3. He, with those of his Principles, made a Shift to bear with; perhaps so much the more easily that, as the Writer of his *Life* tells us, he had been proclaimed a Rebel for not coming in and takeing Part with the Forces of the said K. *James* when they endeavoured to keep Possession of *Ireland* in the Year 1689. What was it then disoblged him? Why the Bishops *Mitre* was touched, and that was of more Consideration than the Kings Crown. The Nonjuring Bishops were dispossessed; their vacant *Sees*, after much Patience, filled with as good Men as themselves. That was never to be digested, and therefore he declared the Establishment a *Schism*.

This was a pretty high Flight, and yet he was not at his Pitch. In the Year 1706 He published his *Epistolary Discourse, proving from the Scriptures and First Fathers, That the Soul is a Principle naturally mortal, wherein is proved, that none have the Power of giving the Divine immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only the Bishops*. Here was a very New and surprizing Scene opened. The *Heathens* that never heard of Christ were made happy by it. The worst they had to fear was, that their Souls should vanish into *thin Air*. But then sad was the Case of all *Separatists* from the *Episcopal* Communion: For though their Souls were neither by Nature Immortal, nor Immortalized by *Episcopal* Baptism; yet, he found a Cue to have them *Immortalized actually by the Pleasure of God to Punishment*. Was ever such horrid Doctrine heard of among Christians? However, that Book, though perhaps the very worst ever saw the Light, had, by accident, one very good Effect. For, such as were before in Danger of being implicitly carried into his Principles by the Fame of his Learning; when they saw that he would force even the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* to vouch for the *Natural Mortality* of the Soul, very justly presumed, that his Reasonings from them in his other Books were to be suspected.

'Tis now worth the while to see how Mr. Rhind refines on this.
 'Tis true, *saith he* p. 24. M. Dodwell seemed to have given his Enemies a Handle against him, by the uncouth Thoughts which he vented in his *Book of the Soul*, but this he did in a manner so learned, & so far above the Comprehension of Ordinary Readers, that, allowing his Opinion to have been Erroneous, yet would not many be in Hazard of being perverted by it. Withall, I considered that my then Search was not to be employed about that *supposed* singular Opinion of his; for what I was then Desirous to know, was only, whether his Arguments for Episcopacy were forcible or not?

Here is a Text worth the commenting on. Did M. Dodwell seem only, did he not really give a handle not only to his Enemies but to all the World that had any Regard for Religion? But why does M. Rhind call it his *Book of the Soul*? Why does he not call it his *Book for Episcopacy*? Episcopacy was the Conclusion intended, the Mortality of the Soul only a Medium for enforcing it. Why does he say it was writ above the Comprehension of ordinary Readers? Did he not write it in English? And is not this a tolerable Presumption that he design'd he should be understood? Is not the Doctrine, to wit, the Mortality of the Soul, so Plain that every Plowman may understand it. But M. Rhind is right: For the Arguments for proving this Doctrine are above the Comprehension not only of ordinary Readers but of extraordinary too, even of all understanding. This I am sure of, that the Floribility of the Wills of Dead Souls (a), separate Souls receiving Water Baptism (b) and the like, are Notions as much above the Capacities of Presbyterians as Jacob Behmen's Lucubrations are. I hope many are not in hazard of being perverted by it. But M. Rhind himself is so unhappy as to be one, for it is not really but a supposed singular Opinion, he will not positively say it is Erroneous, but allowing it to be so, it is not dangerous because of its Obscurity. But how in all the World could he suffer these Words to drop from him, 'That his search was not to be employed about that singular Opinion of M. Dodwell's, but to know whether his Arguments for Episcopacy were forcible or not. Is not the natural Mortality of the Soul,

Soul, and its being immortalized by Episcopal Baptism, or in defect of it, by the *Pleasure of God to Punishment*, one of his Arguments for *Episcopacy*? What meant Mr. Rhind by such a Juggle, thinks he M. Dodwell's Book is not extant, or that all the World is turned quite Senseless and wants Eyes to read it? I cannot think that Mr. Rhind himself upon a Review will say, That he has used the *Sincerity* that would become an expiring Soul.

But to go on with the History of M. Dodwell. As he had proved the *Dissenters* and *Low-Church Schismatics*, so the *Nonjuring High Church Tories*, who continued the Separation after the Death of the deprived Bishops, must, in their Turn, be declared Schismatics too. For this Purpose he published a Book, the last he wrote, entitled, *The Case in View, now in Fact, proving, that the Continuance of a separated Communion without Substitutes, in any of the late invalidly deprived Sees, since the Death of William Lord Bishop of Norwich, is Schismatical. With an Appendix proving, That our late invalidly deprived Fathers had no Right to substitute Successors, who might legitimate the Separation, after that the Schism had been concluded by the Decease of the last Survivor of those same Fathers.* Thus, I think, there were very few in England, Episcopal or Dissenter, of High Church or Low Church, that were not, successively at least, *Schismatics* by M. Dodwell's Account. Plainly, his Head was turned with immoderate Zeal, and therefore *Schism*, *Schism*, was his everlasting Clack. Mr. Rhind indeed has given p. 25 another Character of him. viz. ' That he has stated the Controversy fairly, that his Authorities are pertinent and justly allowed, and that his Deductions from them and all his other Reasonings do proceed in a *Mathematical Chain*. This Character I shall, *ad hominem*, allow: For, whenever I shall, find M. Dodwell's and M. Rhind's Reasonings quite contrary; which I hope not seldom to find in the following Sheets, it will necessary follow that Mr. Rhind is fully answered, a *Mathematical Chain* being more Inviolable than an *Adamantine* one. So much for M. Dodwell.

As for M. Sage, our *Apologist's* other Celebrated Author, all he saies of him is, ' And in Truth, saith he p. 25, 'tis as much as can be said of any Man, That he thought he pursued the Argument in the same Manner with M. Dodwell and improved upon it.

Of this Character the *Panegyric* Part is Hyperbolical, the *Historical* Part false. First, I say, the *Panegyric* Part viz. *That it is as much as can be said of any Man*, is Hyperbolical. No Man that is not blindly Partial will make him a Standard. 'Tis true he was Master of several good Qualities, of a good Capacity and great Application; but the *Revolution* had soured his Temper, which carried him out often to transgress the Rules of Religion as well as Decency; witness his *Fundamental Charter of Presbytry*, particularly his long *Preface* prefixed to it, upon the Account of which, I acknowledge, he deserves the Character of an *Incomparable Author*: For, he has therein treated his Adversary after a Fashion, which, to say no worse of it, will not be easily paralleled. And which makes it so much the more intolerable is, that he did it upon some Points of History, in which his own Friends (c) have at last acknowledged he was mistaken. And how False and Weak his *Historical* Argueings were in the said *Charter* upon the Usage of the *English* Liturgy in *Scotland* has been sufficiently shown in the *Country-man's Letter to the Curat* on that Subject.

'Tis true there is lately published a *Vindication of the Fundamental Charter* in Opposition to the said *Letter*. But I hope, upon comparing the two, The *Vindication* will appear to be a very harmless Piece: For 1. Who is likely ever to be moved by an Author that tells, as that *Vindicator* does p. 165, 'That it is not Sufficient Proof, that a Thing is not, because the Historians are silent about it, no, nor suppose they should all contradict it. Has that Gentleman his History by Inspiration? No, but he would have us to Judge by Histories yet to be written, p. 166. p. 13. 2ly, Who will be moved by his Argueings on *Buchanan*, when, notwithstanding that *Buchanan* is acknowledged to be the sole Relater of what he Argues for, he yet saies, 'That *Buchanan* was doating when he wrote his History, if it came from his Hands, as we have it in all the Editions hitherto published p. 165. 3ly, Who that professes, as the *Vindicator* does p. 9. to write with all possible Candour would say with him p. 164. that *Buchanan* Contradicts himself about *Arthur's Oven*, when no Man ever dealt more candidly than

(c) *Vindication of the Fundamental Charter*. p. 79.

than *Buchanan* has done in that Matter, even though it was of no Consequence. He begins the *Civil History* of his Nation at the *fourth Book*; there, in the Reign of *K. Donald I.* He saies, ' That Work now called *Arthur's Oven*, some have fallſly related to have been the Temple of *Claudius Caesar*. We, so far as we can gueſs, believe it to have been the Temple of *Terminus*. You ſee he makes but a Gueſs of it. To the *Civil History* of his Nation he thought fit to prefix the *Geography* of it and an Account of its *Antiquity*; and there, like a moſt Candid Soul, he retracts his former Gueſs upon better Information, and in the *fiſt Book* delivers himſelf thus. ' I indeed was once induced by a Conjecture (*by this it appears, that the Civil History was written before the Geographical Part*) to believe it to have been the Temple of *Terminus*, which (we have learned) uſed to be built Round and open above : But then he tells, that he was informed by credible Perſons That there were ſeveral other Buildings of the ſame Form in other Places of the Nation. This, ſaith he, forced me to ſuſpend my Opinion---- Say now, good Reader, is there any *Doating* here in *Buchanan*, when he is ſo watchfull even over his Eſcapes in Gueſſings? Is there any contradiction here? Did not *Auguſtine* write two full Books of *Retractions*, and one of them too of what he wrote when he was a Biſhop? And does not every Man applaud his Ingenuity for doing ſo? Nay, has not *M. Dodwell* himſelf retracted (d) even in point of Hiſtory? And yet who blames him for it? 4thly, Who, to avoid the Force of *Dr. Burnet* now Biſhop of *Sarum* his Teſtimony from the Pulpit before the Houſe of *Commons*, concerning what he had ſeen, and Papers he had had in his Hands, would put off the Matter by telling, as the *Vindicator* does p. 36, that the Biſhop is not Infallible, and that all he preached in 1688 was not Gospel, and that he ſometimes preached Extempore? Was not this a moſt Bitter Way of giving him the Lye, and, which makes the Treatment ſtill the more Rude, he at the ſame Time declares, that it were uncivil and uncharitable in him to Queſtion the Doctor's Candour and Veracity. Is this the grave *Vindicator*? Is the World to far loſt, as to take *Slyneſs* for Sincerity, and Affectation for

E

Gra.

Gravity? 5thly, Who that reads the Dr's Sermon, knows his Character, or ever heard of his Concernment in the Project of *Comprehension* will alledge his Words to be Capable of any other *Entendre* than the *Country-man* has put on them? 6thly, Who would deny that the Dr's Testimony bears, 'That the Ceremonies 'miss'd narrowly of being thrown out by an *Act* of the *Convoca-* 'tion, when it was carried by the greatest Number of the Voices 'of the Members that were present in the *lower House* that they 'should be laid aside; And when the Bishops (who make the upper House) were the same Way affected, the Queen's *Stiffness* in maintaining them, saith the Dr, *not flowing from their Counsels, but from disguised Papists*; Will any Man, that designs not to trifle, deny that this was a *narrow Miss*? But the *Vindicator* overlooked the Bishops in the Dr's Testimony. 7thly, The Author of the *Charter* had affirmed that our *Country-man Ales* was a Member of the *English* Convocation. The *Country-man* had proved beyond Contradiction that *Ales* was not a Member. What saies the *Vindicator* to this? It was only an *Impropriety of Speech* in the *Acurate* Author. Every Man ought to despair, after such an Answer, to convince the *Vindicator* that it is Light at mid-day. But the Answer is indeed as solid, as the Epithet of *Acurate* is Judiciously chosen in that Place.

But I acknowledge all this is a Digression from M. Rhind's Book. I have only adduced these Instances to convince the Reader that if the *Country-man*, who is my good Friend and next Neighbour, don't give himself the Trouble of makeing any *Return* to the said *Vindication*, 'tis plain it is, because it needs none. The reading over his *Letter* once more after the *Vendication* being at once an Easie and Sufficient Answer to it. I return then to Mr. Rhind.

In the second Place, his *historical* Part of M. Sage's Character viz. that he has pursued the Argument in the same Manner with M. Dodwell, is false. M. Dodwell in all his Books upon Church Government (e) asserts the Bishop's Sole Power, and though he is content to give a *Consultory* Power to the *Presbyters*, which every Christian Man and

[e] See Dissert. Cypr. Numb. 13, 14, 15. *Targent*. Sect. 37. Frommonition to the Epistolary discourse.
p. 15, 22.

and Woman has, it being lawfull to all or any of the People to say to *Archippus*, Take heed to the Ministry---, yet he peremptorly refuses them a *Decretory* Power. M. Sage on the other Hand not only denies the said *Sole Power*, but applies himself in his *Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianick Age* to disprove the Bishops claiming of it. Was this to pursue the *Argument after the same Manner*? That Excellent Person M. JAMESON wrote His *Cyprianus Isotimus* in Answer to the said *Vindication*. And answer it he did beyond Possibility of Reply. M. Sage Himself was abundantly Sensible of this, He lived half a *Dozen* Years after M. *Jameson's* Book was Published, but never essayed to make a Return. He could not but see how he had mistaken his Measures and prejudged the Cause. And therefore as he *could* not with any ground of Reason, so he *would* not, out of Love to the Cause, insist. And I doubt not but it was very heavy to his Spirit to Survive the Reputation of his principal Book; and to think that he should have wasted the precious Lamp of Life in so voluminous a Work, for proving that Bishops did not claim a *Sole Power*, when not only his learned Adversary had proved, beyond Contradiction, that they did so, but the most learned of his own Parry allowed, that it was Their Right to claim it. So much for Mr. *Rhind's* Narrative.

C H A P. II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's first Reason for Separating from the Presbyterian Party viz That They are Schismatics in Point of Government, is Examined. From P. 29. to P. 119.

FOR Justifieing this Reason of Separation Mr. Rhind uses the following Method. First. He lays down two Principles from which he subsumes some Corollaries. 2dly, He states the Debate, and 3dly advances his Arguments.

S E C T. I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Principles and Corollaries P. 29, are examined.

HIS two Principles are. I ' That the Church is but one. II That ' it is a Society distinct from and Independent upon the State.

From the first of these Principles he infers these two Corollaries. ' I ' That the ordinary Means of Salvation are confined to the Church. ' II. That whoever are without (but more especially they who separate from its Communion) are out of the ordinary Way of Salvation. From

From the Second of these *Principles* he inferrs these three *Corollaries*. ' I That the Church has distinct Laws, and a Government and Governours of its own which can serve all the Purposes of the Society. II That that which does properly denominate one a Member of the Church is the Acknowledgement of its Laws and Government, and a Submission to the Authority of its Governours: Nor is the owning any one of those enough without the other. III. That the Contempt either of its Laws or Lawfull Governours, requiring no Terms of Communion that are truly sinfull, justly deprives one of the Priviledges of this as well as any other Society.

From all this he concludes p 30. 31. ' That that Society which is not only Defective with respect to that Form of Government that obtain'd in the Days of Christ and his Apostles and downwards (which is undoubtedly the Rightfull one) but does likewise disown and oppose those who govern after that Manner, is without the Church by the *third* Corollary, and consequently out of the ordinary Road to Heaven according to the *Second* Corollary from the *first* Principle. And that the Presbyterians are thus Defective in, and disown and oppose that Government, he is, after stating the Debate, to make good by Arguments.

This is his Scheme, but notwithstanding its *Mathematical* Face ; as it will not please the *Presbyterians*, so yet far less the Church of *England* which he has joined.

First, it will not please the *Presbyterians*, as he too confidently presumes. For, tho' they willingly admitt his *first* Principle, *That the Church is but one*, and do firmly believe that there is but *one* Government by *Divine Right* viz. the *Presbyterian*, and zealously wish that it might obtain all the World over ; yet by no Means will they assert that such as either oppose or want that Government are *without* the Church. The Government of many of the *Protestant* Churches in *Germany* is Superintendency, that of *New England* Independency, that of *Old England* Prelacy. The *Presbyterians* believe, They are each of them in an Error; the *last* especially in a Hugely great one ; And yet they believe them all to be within the Church and capable of Salvation; if they are otherwise good Christians ; And that, as an *English* Poet has it somewhere,

The God that pardons Sin will pardon Errors too.

They own the Road to Heaven is narrow, yet they don't believe it so narrow, but that they can charitably hope that one Company may walk to it with a *Presbyterian* Minister on their Head; and another (tho' not in so straight a Line) with a *Bishop* on theirs. 'Tis told of Mr. *Rhind* (and he allows us p. 9. to represent him to have been a *Presbyterian of the most rigid Kind*) that while he was studying Theology at *Edinburgh* among the *Presbyterians*, he made it a Question in a Society of his Fellow Students, Whether an *Episcopal* Minister dying in that Opinion cou'd be saved? I suppose he was the first *Presbyterian* ever started the Question, and possibly may be the last. But some Peoples Brains are figured for Bigotry, on whatever Side they are. Whether it be by *Nature* or *Accident* They are so, I refer it to such as have Skill in the *Animal Oeconomy*.

Secondly, I say Mr. *Rhind's* Scheme will yet far less please the Church of *England* which he has joined; Which I shall make good in two particulars; when once I have premised, That by the Church of *England* I do not mean only this or the other particular *Doctor*, but that I mean her *Articles*, *Homilies*, *Liturgy*, *Canons* and such other publick *Formula's*.

First. Tho' the Church of *England* thinks *Prelacy* the best Government, yet she is very far from *unchurching* those that want it. In her *Nineteenth Article* she defines the *visible Church* of Christ to be 'a Congregation of faithfull Men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duely administred according to Christ's Ordinance, in all those things that of Necessity are requisite to the same?' In her *twenty third Article* She declares, 'That those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this Work by Men who have publick Authority given to them, in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's Vineyard? In neither of these *Articles*, tho' they were the only Place for doing it, is any one particular Form of Church-Government declared Necessary. Nay, the *Articles* are conceived in such general Words on Purpose, that they might not be thought to exclude other Churches that differ from them in point of Government. So saies the

the Bishop of *Sarum* (f) whose Sufficiency to understand the Intent of the *Articles* was never doubted, and whose Concern for the Episcopal Cause in Reason cannot. 'And, adds he, whatever some hotter Spirits have thought of this, since that Time; Yet we are very sure, that not only those who penned the *Articles*, but the Body of this Church for above half an Age after, did notwithstanding those Irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches so constituted, to be true Churches as to all the Essentials of a Church. And p. 260. *Neither our Reformers nor their Successors for near eighty Years after those Articles were published, did ever question the Constitution of such Churches.* And the Noble Historian *Clarendon* † who was abundantly zealous for the Church, represents it as a false Step in the Government of K. *Charles I* that the *English* Ambassadour with his Retinue separated from the Protestant Church at *Charenton* contrary to former usage. Yet further, the Church of *England* was powerfully attacked by the *Romanists* in the Days of the late K. *James*; and upon the very same Scheme too which Mr. *Rhind* hath advanced viz. Metaphysical Inferences from the Unity of the Church; from which they would needs conclude her to be *Schismatical*. The *English* Divines never made a more noble Appearance than on that Occasion. They engaged with the *Romanists* and defeat them to the Conviction of all the World, but then it was by Reasonings which quite overturn Mr. *Rhind's* Scheme. Dr. *Sherlock* first enters the Field, and with open Mouth declares (g) against the Unchurching Doctrine for the want of *Episcopal* Government. 'I am sure, saith he, that is not a safe Communion where there is not a Succession of Apostolical Doctrine; but whether the Want of a Succession of Bishops, will in all Cases unchurch, will admit of a greater Dispute: I am sure a true Faith in Christ, with a true Gospel Conversation, will save Men; And some learned *Romanists* defend that old Definition of the Church, That it is *Cetus Fidelium*, the Company of the Faithfull, and will not admit Bishops or Pastors into the Definition of a Church. Thus he. Dr. *Clagget* succeeds him, and goes yet more roundly to Work. He affirms indeed (h) as we

[f] Expos. Art. XIII. p. 259. † Hist. Rebell. [g] Vindication of the Dissent concerning the Notes of the Church p. 53. [h] Upon Bellarmine's Fifth Note of the Church.

we do, the Church to be *one* in many Respects viz. of *Head, Faith, Sacraments, Service and Government* too. But expressly denies *that any of these Kinds and Instances of Unity are necessary to the Being of a Church, except these of one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.* And further asserts, 'that from the Apostles Times till the Council of *Trent*, the constant 'Universal Doctrine concerning the Church was this, That it is the 'Society of the Faithfull, without ever inserting into the Definition 'of it any Thing relating to its being united to the Pope, or ANY 'OTHER BISHOP as to a visible Head. To both these you may add Mr. *Stillingfleet* afterwards Bishop of *Worcester*, who has proved (i) beyond Contradiction that the main Bulk of the Ancient Bishops and Divines of the Church of *England*, from the first Dawning of the Reformation almost down to *Laud*, have expressly declared against the Necessity of *Episcopal* Government, and maintained the Mutability of Church Government according to the Will of the Prince or Circumstances of the Kingdom; and herein they were against Mr. *Rhind* and his Fellows. And that they have also acknowledged the Scripture Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, asserting the *Names* to be interchangeable and the *Office* the same. And herein they were for the Presbyterians.

Secondly. This is not the only Quarrell the Church of *England* has against Mr. *Rhind's* Scheme. No one wonders to find the *Presbyterians* asserting the *Intrinsic Power* of the Church. They still claimed it, have been always wrestling for it, to be sure they never renounced it; but it certainly very ill becomes one who has joined the Church of *England* to lay it down for a Principle, as he has done, *that the Church is independent of the State.* If so, what then means the 21 Article which declares, 'that General Councils may not be 'gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes? Are not these necessary for serving the Purposes of the Society? The Church independent of the State! What then means the 37 Article which declares 'the Queen's Majesty to have the Chief Power and 'Government of all Estates whether Ecclesiastical or Civil and in all 'Causes? The Church independent of the State! What then means the first Canon 1640 concerning the Regal Power, wherein the King's Supremacy

premacꝝ over the Ecclesiastical State and in Causes Ecclesiastical is not only asserted but argued for: And the Government of the Church declared to belong *in Chief* unto Kings, and that the Power to call and dissolve Councils both National and Provincial is the *true Right* of all Christian Kings within their own Realms and Territories, and that when in the first Times of Christ's Church Prelats used this Power, it was therefore only because in those Days They had no Christian Kings. *The Church Independent of the State!* What then means the first Canon 1603 the very Rubrick whereof is, *The King's Supremacy over the Church of England in Causes Ecclesiastical to be maintain'd!* *The Church Independent of the State!* What then meant the Bishop of Norwich Anno 1709 in his *Visitation Charge* to spend a good Part of his Discourse and a large *Appendix* in cautioning his Clergy against that Principle? Say now, good Reader, if Mr. Rhind has not been competently furnished with Assurance when he declared p, 29 His Principles and Corollaries *to be Truths so evident, that he thought it needless to enlarge on them.* Had he intended only a Dispute against the *Presbyterians* he might indeed have assumed the *Independency of the Church* for a Principle: But when he was to tell the World what satisfied his own Conscience, and determin'd him to go over to the Church of *England*, which in the most solemn Manner has renounced that Principle, the insisting on it was one of the greatest Inconsistencies a Man could be guilty of.

I shall conclude this Discourse upon his Scheme with one *Observation*. Mr. Rhind would needs have the *Presbyterians* to be *Schismatics*, and thence inferrs That they are *without* the Church. But this is horridly false Reasoning: For, I affirm That, if they are *Schismatics*, then it will follow that they are *within* the Church. I know this will be surprizing at first to some Readers, yet it is certainly true. The *Romanists*, in the Days of the late K. James, reasoned, exactly after the same Manner with Mr. Rhind, against the Church of *England*: But that great Author before mentioned, I mean Dr. *Sherlock* demonstrates that pretended Reasoning to be flat Nonsense, and his Words will abundantly clear my Assertion.

' A *Schismatical* Church, saith he, (k) signifies a Church too, and
 ' how they are a Church without belonging to the *one* Church,
 ' when there is but *one* Church, is somewhat Mysterious. And
 ' therefore *Schism* is not tearing off a Part of the Church, but
 ' one Part dividing from the other in external Communion, which
 ' supposes that both Parts still belong to the same Church, or else
 ' the Church is not divided. For *Apostacy* and *Schism* are two
 ' different Things; *Apostates* cease to be of the Church, *Schismatics*
 ' are of the Church still, though they disturb the Peace of the
 ' Church and divide the external Communion of it --- Does St.
 ' Paul, who reproves the *Corinthians* for their Schisms, shut them
 ' out of the Church for them too? Does He deny them to belong
 ' to the Church, when He directs His Epistle *to the Church of God*
 ' *at Corinth*. Thus he. So very loosely knit is Mr. *Rhind's* Scheme,
 that the one Part of it destroys the other. And if he can prove
 the Presbyterians *Schismatics*, *eo ipso* it will follow, that they are
 not *without* the Church. Dr. *Sherlock's* Reasoning is Plain, Strong,
 palpable Sense, against which Mr. *Dodwell's* usual Style, though
 founded upon some loose expressions of the *Fathers*, will never bear
 out Mr. *Rhind*. Nor is Mr. *Rhind* altogether a Loser by this
 Observe: For whereas he hints in his *Preface*, that he has been
 upbraided with *Apostacy* by some; though I am as well assur'd he
 is a *Schismatick*, as I am, that there is such a Sin as *Schism*; yet,
 upon the former Reasoning, he ought not to be called an *Apostate*,
 till he declare himself a little more Explicitly. I hope then he will
 digest the Observation the more easily, that what he looses by it
 in Argument, he saves in Character.

SECT.

 (k) Ubi supra p. 27. 28.

S E C T. II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's State of the Debate betwixt the Presbyterians and Episcopalians, P. 31, 32. is Examined.

THE Stateing of a Debate aright is always a principal Point in Controversy. Take it in Mr. Rhind's own Words. 'It is sufficient to answer my Design in this short *Apology*, if I can prove that the Government of the Church, from the Beginning, was managed by *Officers* of different Orders, and such as acted in Capacities, superior the one to the other; among whom there were neither Ruling Elders, nor Deacons, such as the *Presbyterians* have. This, saith he, is all that the Episcopal Writers plead for. And therefore he thinks it needless to determine more explicitly, what are the distinguishing Characteristicks of the several *Officers*, or to fix the Bounds of their Respective Powers. Thus he. Now let us Remark a little upon it.

I. Why does he State the Debate upon a Subordination of *Officers*? Was there ever Presbyterian denied, that there should be a Subordination among the *Officers* as well as *Judicatories* of the Church? Do not they own *Christ* to be the Chief Sheepherd, the absolute King and Monarch of the Church? Don't They own *Presbyter*s to be under him, *Deacons* under both? Is not here a fair Subordination of *Officers*? If he had stated the Debate upon a Subordination or Imparity of *Pastors* or *Ministers*, takeing these Words in their Current Ecclesiastical Sense, it had been to the Purpose; but to State it upon a Subordination or Imparity of *Rulers* or *Officers* was to lay a Foundation to himself for Chicane.

Possibly he may think to ward off this Remark by what he has

added, *That among these Subordinate Officers, there were neither Ruling Elders nor Deacons such as the Presbyterians have.* This, I acknowledge, when proved; will be a considerable Point gained against the *Presbyterians*. But then 1mo. Why has he not restricted himself to the Proof of this? For, in all his *State of the Debate*, there is not one Syllable more to the Purpose; and yet of the 90 Pages he has spent in the Prosecution of it, he has employed only five of them, and these ^{ten} ~~two~~ only by the by, against the *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons*. With what Success we shall afterward hear. 2do. When he has proved, which yet I despair of finding done, *that among these Subordinate Officers, there were neither Ruling Elders nor Deacons such as the Presbyterians have*, it will indeed follow that the *Presbyterians*, are mistaken in the Characters and Functions of their Subordinate Officers. But by no means will it follow That they are against a Subordination of Officers. On the Contrary, Mr. Rhind's Disputing against the *Presbyterian Ruling Elders* and *Deacons* proves irrefragably, that they are for a Subordination of Officers. I desire every Reader of Mr. Rhind's Book to attend carefully to this, and they will see there is no more needfull for discovering the Uselessness of all his Arguments for a Subordination of Officers, the *Presbyterians* being as much for it as the *Prelatists* are; and that his latter Part of the Debate is a most effectual Confutation of the former.

II. Why does he say, That a Subordination of Officers, without such *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons* as the *Presbyterians* have, is upon the Main all that the *Episcopal Writers* plead for? Of all Things in the World unfincere Dealing is the most Odious. Certainly he has taken it for a Principle, That none who was to read his Book had ever read the *Episcopal Writers*, or would ever be Capable of reading them. Is he yet to learn, That the sole Power is pleaded for by them? Having read so many Books of that Side, can his Judgement be so weak as not to have discerned, or his Memory so frail as to have forgot, that all the Elevations of an absolute Monarch accountable to God only are pleaded for by them? If so, Care shall be taken ere I have done to clear up his Discernment and refresh his Memory. Does he Imagine that a Subordination and sole Power are all one? Or will a meer Subordination with-

out Presbyterian *Elders* or *Deacons* please him? If so, he is too well natured: For, alas, it will not please his Brethren. To Humour him a little, I shall suppose the *Presbyterians* content to accept of Constant Moderators for *Term of Life*, and that such Moderators have the *Presidency* in all their Assemblies: But would that save them from the Guilt of *Schism*? Mr. *Dodwell* has expressly said it will not. Hear him (1). 'This (a *Principle of Unity*) none of our Modern Sects, except the *Presbyterians*, can so much as offer at. None of them (the other *Modern Sects*) have any single Minister, who by their Principles can pretend to Superiority over his Brethren. And all that they (the *Presbyterians*) can pretend is a Moderator over their Classes, either for a certain Time or at the utmost for *Term of Life*. Yet even that is not Sufficient for a *Principal of Unity*. Seeing the Sacrifices are they which are the Cement of this Unity, it must be a *Presidency*, not in their Assemblies only but their Sacrifices, which can entitle to a *Principle of it*. Thus M. *Dodwell*. And what now would it signify though *Presbyterians* should grant all that Subordination which Mr. *Rhind* pleads for, when notwithstanding, They must still remain *Schismatics* by M. *Dodwell's* Verdict.

III. Why did he think it *needless* to determine more explicitly the several *Characteristicks* of the several Officers and to fix the Bounds of their *Respective Powers*? About what, I pray, is all the Controversy betwixt *Prelatists* and *Presbyterians*? Is it about the Title of *Bishop*? 'Tis yielded on both Hands to be a Scriptural one. Is it whether there should be *Bishops* in the Church? The *Presbyterian* was never yet created who denied it. Is it that these *Bishops* should have Officers subordinate to them? The *Presbyterians* loudly assert it. Is it not then the Controversy about the *Characteristicks* and Powers of *Bishops*, wherein the Choak lyes? And yet Mr. *Rhind* thinks it *needless* to determine them more explicitly. If so, 'tis very plain he should have thought it *needless* to have written his Book. If the *Prelatists* can prove, that *Bishops* by *Divine Right* should be *absolute Monarchs*; or, to come lower, that they should have a *Negative Voice* simple or even *Reciprocal*; If they can prove, that by *Divine Right* they

[1] One Priesthood. Chap. XIII. Sect. 13. p. 396.

they have the *sole* Power of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction* or either of them. If they can prove, that by *Divine Right* they should have some *Hundreds* or even *Scores* of Congregations under their Inspection ; *Presbyterians* are heartily content to yield the Cause, and to accept of *Bishops* with all these Powers or *so many* of them as they shall prove of *Divine Right* to belong to them. On the other Hand, if the *Prelatists* are content with *Bishops* that are neither *absolute Monarchs*, nor have a *Negative Voice*, nor *sole* Power, nor a *greater Charge* than they can personally inspect, that is, preach and dispense the Sacraments to, with the Assistance of *Elders* to oversee the Manners of the People, (and of *Deacons* to take Care of the Poor) and that Discipline may be duly exercised ; the *Presbyterians* offer to prove that they have such *Bishops* already, or are content to take them where they have not. Is it possible fairer Conditions can be either demanded or offered ? Why then did Mr. Rhind decline to explain himself ? The Reason is obvious, He designed to harangue a while, and disputing would have marred the Cadency of his Periods.

IV. Supposing Mr. Rhind's State of the Debate had been more Distinct than it is, it would answer only the one Half of his Undertaking in the *Title Page*. For tho' it might be a Reason for *His separating from the Presbyterians*, yet it would be none for *His embracing the Communion of the Church* according to his present Practice, unless he had proved that the Subordination of Officers in the Church of *England* Constitution, into which he is gone, were of *Divine Institution* ; Which he has not so much as attempted to prove, I add nor can be proved. For, that *Primats* or *Arch Bishops* having a Power over and being *Ordinaries* to the other *Bishops*, that *Bishops* exercising a *Sole Power* or even a *Negative Voice*, that *Presbyters* serving as the Bishop's *Delegates* without Power of *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction*, that *Preaching Deacons* vested with a Power of Baptizing, but deprived of all Management of the Churches Stock or Care of the Poor, which was the Original Design of Their Office ; that, I say, all or any of these Officers considered under these peculiar Characters, are the Creatures of God, or of *Divine Institution*, I positively deny, and want to be directed to any Author that has proven it.

So much for Mr. Rhind's Way of stating the Debate : And, I believe,

lieve, 'tis obvious to every Body, that thereby he has projected for his own Ease rather than the Reader's Conviction. For, let one, in perusing his Book, dash out the Word *Officers* or *Rulers*, an Imparity or Subordination among which the *Presbyterians* grant, and substitute in Place thereof the Word *Pastors* or *Ministers*, a Parity among whom was his Business to disprove; and it will presently appear that several of his Arguments are Just as much to the Purpose, as an *Ode* of *Horace* would have been.

But there is no need of running into Niceties in this Matter. Every Body has a tolerable Notion in the Gross what is meant by *Prelacy* and *Presbytry*. If Mr. *Rhind's* Arguments prove, that the *latter* is a *Schismatical* kind of Government, the *former* that which *should* obtain in the Church, I shall grant he has gained his Point. If they prove not that, 'tis nothing to us what else they prove. And whether they do so or not, I am now to apply my Self to try.

S E C T. III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Arguments for Prelacy are summed up.

HE has cast his Arguments into the Form of a *Harangue*; but so far as I can distinguish them they amount to the Number of *Nine*. The three first of which are calculate to *argue* that *Prelacy should* have been instituted; the six latter to *prove* that it *actually was* instituted.

First That it was necessary that *Prelacy should* be instituted, he argues

I. From

I. From the Nature of the Thing which made it Indispensibly necessary in it self. A Monarchical or Subordinate Form being able to answer the Ends of Government better than the Contrary.

II. From the Form of Government in the *Jewish* Church, seeing God must be uniform in his Actings.

III. From the ~~Form~~ the Rules of political Prudence, seeing a levelling Form of Government would have been distastfull both to the *Jews* and *Romans*, as being Opposite to the Hierarchy of the former, and Monarchy of the latter.

Secondly That it actually *was* instituted, he attempts to prove.

I. From its obtaining in the Days of Christ, as appears from the Subordination of the *LXX* to the *Twelve*.

II. From its being continued in the Days of the Apostles, as appears from the History of their *Acts*, and their *Epistles*, and a Succession in the Apostolate.

III. From the Episcopacy of *Timothy* and *Titus*.

IV. From the Apocalyptick Angels.

V. From Testimonies of Antiquity.

VI. From the Impossibility of its Obtaining so early and universally, if it had not been of Divine Institution.

All these (besides what he has advanced against the *Presbyterian Ruling Elders* and *Deacons*) I shall examine in Order.

S E C T. IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Arguings for proving, that it was Necessary that the Prelatick Form of Government should have been at first Instituted, is Examined. From P. 32. to P. 49.

I Have just now observed that he attempts this by *three Arguments*, which I shall examine in so many *Articles*. Let me only
once

once more advertise the Reader, that Mr. Rhind's expressing himself in this Controversy by a *Subordinate* Form of Government on the one Hand, and a *levelling* Form of Government on the other, with such like Phrases, is a very Ridiculous as well as unjust Stile: For, the *Presbyterians* are *against* a *Levelling*, they are for a *Subordinate* Form of Government, yea, they are for a *Monarchical* Form of Government, understanding our Lord to be that Monarch; as Mr. Rhind Himself does p. 49. Though then Mr. Rhind found it necessary for amusing his Reader and filling his Pages to use such Forms of Speaking as a *Monarchical* or *Subordinate*, a *Republican* or *Levelling* Form of Government; yet I must either neglect his Arguments altogether, as signifying nothing in this Controversy, or else I must plainly understand by these and the like Phrases *Prelacy* or *Presbytry* respectively, as common Usage has fixed the Notion of them in this Controversy. This premised I now proceed.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument, for the Indispensible Necessity of Instituting Prelacy, from the Nature of the Thing is examined. From P. 32. to P. 39.

THE Summ of his Argument is this. God could not but institute the *Best* Form of Government for his Church. A Government of a *Monarchical* or *Subordinate* Form is *such*, that is, it can answer the Design of Society better than *any* other. Therefore

G fore

fore the Church *ought* to have that Form of Government, that is to say, *Prelacy*. Now let us consider this, and

I: I affirm this Way of Arguing labours under *three* very considerable Infirmities. *First*. It is not *Modest*. *Secondly*. not *secure*. *Thirdly*. Suppose it were both; yet, as he has laid it, it is quite *Impertinent*, and does not in the least affect the *Presbyterians*.

First. It is not *Modest*. Does it become the Creature to prescribe to God? Is it sufferable that one should talk at Mr. Rhind's Rate, That such a Form of Government, abstracting from and antecedently to the *Divine* Establishment, *OUGHT* to be, *MUST* be, is *indispensibly Necessary* in it self, that *it does not look like God* that it should be otherwise, all which are his Phrases? Is not this to set Bounds to God's Wisdom and Will? I must needs read a Lecture to Mr. Rhind from the judicious Hooker (*m*) to teach him more Reverence towards God. 'As for those *marvellous* Discourses, whereby they *adventure* to argue that God *must* needs have done the Thing which they *imagine* was to be done, I must confess, I have *often* wondred at their *exceeding* Boldness herein. When the Question is, whether God have delivered in Scripture (as they affirm he hath) a compleat particular, *immutable* Form of Church Policy; why take they that other both *presumptuous* and *superfluous* Labour to prove He *should* have done it, there being *no* Way in this Case to prove the Deed of God, saveing *only* by producing that Evidence wherein he hath done it. -- When we do otherwise, surely we *exceed* our Bounds; who and where we are we forget. And therefore needfull it is that our *Pride* in such Cases be controuled, and our Disputes beaten back with those Demands of the Blessed Apostle, *How unsearchable are his Judgments, and his Ways past finding out? Who hath known the Mind of the Lord, or who was his Counsellor? ----* In Matters which concern the Actions of God the most dutifull Way on our Part is to search what God *hath* done and with Meeknets to admire that, rather than to Dispute what he in Congruity of Reason *ought* to do. I'm sure it is Mr. Rhind's Duty to chew the Cud a while on this.

Secondly. It is not *Secure*. For, Circumstances may make that
best

best in one Case, which would not be so in another. Hear M. Dodwell (n) who will clear the Matter. ‘ The Way of Arguing from the *actual Establishments* of God, as it is much more *Modest*, so it is also much more *Secure* for finding out the *Right* of Government than any *Conjectures* we can make from the *Reason* of the Thing. It is certainly the most becoming Course for a *Modest Christian* in all Things to acquiesce in God’s *Judgment*, how great Evidence soever there might seem for differing from it.--- The *Reasons* from the *Nature* of Government in General, and peculiarly of Government as *Ecclesiastical*, are not proper to any one Age. But for bringing these Reasonings down to determine the *Rights* of any particular Government, many particular *Matters* of *Fact* are requisite to be known. Thus he.

Thirdly. His Argument, as he has laid it is quite *Impertinent*, and does not in the least affect the *Presbyterians* : For he adduces it to prove that there should be a Subordination of *Officers* in the Church, which the *Presbyterians* are for, as well as he.

II. Supposing his Argument were otherwise tolerable, How does he prove that a *Monarchical* or *Subordinate* Form of Government is the best? Why, waving the many Arguments of several learned Authors he will needs advance three of his own. The first is taken from the *British Monarchy*. The second from the *Principles*. The third from the *Practices* of the *Presbyterians* Themselves.

The first from the *British Monarchy* stands thus. All the Subjects of *Britain* must own Monarchy to be the best Form of Government for the *State* ; and therefore he sees no Reason from the *Nature of the Thing* why it should not be reckoned such for the Church also. Nay that it looks not like God it should be otherwise p. 33. But this is as unhappy an Argument as Mr. Rhind could have pitched on. For imo. Unless he could prove (perhaps Dr. Lessly may help him to it) that Monarchy is the *only* Government by *divine Right* for the *State*, and that all the Nations of the World who are under any other kind of Government, are, on that Account, in a State of Mortal Sin, his Argument must do a great deal more Hurt than Good to the *Episcopal Cause*. For it will plainly follow

G 2

that

[b] On Schism Chap. XIX. Se^t. 39. 40. p. 454. 455.

that such Nations as have an *Aristocratical* or *Democratical* Form of Government in the *State*, and are perswaded it is *best*, should have the like in the *Church* too. The *British* Subjects are indeed perswaded that Monarchy is the *best* Government for *Britain*, and, I believe, will always be of this Mind, while so Benign a Princess as Her Majesty fills the Throne; but these same Persons are not perswaded that it would be the *best* for the *United Provinces*, the Republicks of *Venice*, *Genoa*, *Lucca*, the *Swiss Cantons*, *Geneva*, &c, and consequently, they must be perswaded too, according to Mr. *Rhind's* Way of Reasoning, that a Monarchical Government in the *Church* would not be best for them. His Argument then would quite alter its Nature by a Voyage, and from being a good one for Episcopacy at Home, would become a good one *against* it beyond Sea. 2^{do}. Is it not pretty odd to find one who has read the Bible all over, as Mr. *Rhind* saith he has done, and has heard our Saviour not only declaring that His Kingdom is not of this World, but expressly discharging his Disciples to exercise such Dominion and Authority as the Princes of the Gentiles do, Is it not odd, I say, to find such a one urging the Cutting the Church Government by the Pattern of the State? Does he not know that it was the Fancy of Modelling the external Government of the Church according to the Civil Government of the *Roman Empire* that brought in such Officers to the Church, of whom there is just as much Mention in the Scripture, as there is of the Present Emperour of *Morocco* or *Czar of Muscovy* (o). I referr it then to the Reader to Judge, if that can be a good Argument for determining the Government of the Church, which was the greatest Cause of her Corruption. 3^{ro}. As Mr. *Rhind* has laid the *British* Monarchy in the one Scale, so he must allow me to lay some Instances in the other, and let the Reader weigh both. The *Romans*, who were the greatest Masters of civil Prudence ever the World knew, when once they had expelled the *Tarquins* and abolished Regal Government, though they used sometimes *Aristocracy*, sometimes *Democracy* or a Form mixt of both, yet were never so idle or ill advised as to think of setting up Monarchy again till Usurpers and Tyrants oppressed them, and by

main.

main Force wrung their Liberties out of their Hands. *Lycurgus* and *Solon* were the wisest Men of their Age by the Verdict of all the World, yet they set up, the One *Aristocracy*, the other *Democracy*, and recommended them for ever to their People. *Plato* and *Aristotle* are Names will be ever had in Veneration, yet they had but very indifferent Thoughts of Monarchy because of its Liableness to degenerate into Tyranny. And that which makes the *British* Monarchy so desirable is that the two Houses of Parliament qualifye it, and give it a Mixture both of *Aristocracy* and *Democracy*; Whereas the *Prelacy* contended for by its late Patrons, is a downright Tyranny, a Monarchy after the French Form, none daring to say to the Bishop, *what doest thou?* as we shall hear afterward. 4to. Is it not strange that the Church of *England* Divines (*Dr. Whitaker*, for Instance, *Regius Professor* of Divinity in *Cambridge*) when disputing against the Church of *Rome* should argue against a Monarchical Government in the Church; and yet that *Mr. Rhind*, who pretends to be of that Communion, should argue for it when disputing against the *Presbyterians*? I want mightily to be satisfied about his Conduct in this.

His Second Argument from the Principles of the *Presbyterians* runs thus p. 34. *I wou'd know of them, why they are for a Subordination of Judicatories, while they are at the same Time against an Imparity of Rulers?* Really the *Presbyterians* own themselves so dull, as not to be able to give a Reason for that which is not. Let *Mr. Rhind* once prove that they are against an *Imparity of Rulers*, and then it will be soon enough to give a Reason why they are so: For they are not disposed to philosophize on the *Golden Tooth*. He never suspected that his *Medium* wanted Truth; and therefore he goes on very innocently in his Harangue thus. 'To what Purpose, I wou'd ask them, serves a Subordination of Judicatories, where the Judges are supposed to be still the same? Did *Mr. Rhind* never hear that *plus vident Oculi quam Oculus*, *Two Eyes see better than One*? Does he not know that all the Apostles were Equal in their Apostolical Character, and when the Controversy about *Circumcision* was started at *Antioch Acts*, 15. Doubtless *Paul*, being under an infallible Conduct, could have determined it as Orthodoxy as the whole College of 'em; yet, for satisfieing Peoples Minds, it was judged expedient that the Advice

of the rest should be had, and their Authority interposed. O but saith he, *In the Presbyterian Subordination the Judges are still the same.* Now, what could put this in his Head, or how he could possibly stumble into it, I cannot conjecture. Was he so long among the *Presbyterians* and does not know it to be false? Could he meet with never one in the whole Country to tell him it was so? When I'm sure there are very few in the Nation but could have done it. All Matters that come from a Subordinate to a Superiour Judicatory are transmitted either by way of *Reference* or *Appeal*. In the first of these Cases the *Judges* are not meerly the same, but a vast Plurality added to them, for Instance, when a Matter is *Referred* from a *Presbytry* to a *Synod*, the whole Ministers of the Province with a Ruling Elder from each Parish are Judges in the latter: Whereas in the former, only the Ministers of that particular *Presbytry* with one Ruling Elder from each of its Parishes were the Judges. In the Case of *Appeals*, not one Member of the Inferior Judicatory is admitted to be a Judge in the Superior. They are indeed allowed to *plead*, but the pleading being over, they are not allowed to *advise* much less to *vote* in the Process. The Use then of a Subordination of Judicatories is obvious, to wit, that the Superior may rectifie the Mistakes &c of the Inferiour. But this will not go down with Mr. Rhind: For he cannot *understand* how their Fellow Members (to whom they are supposed in all Respects equal) shall judge better than they. I know no Body obliged to find him in *Understanding*. The Thing is abundantly Intelligible in its self, Solomon a wise enough Master having told us, that *In Multitude of Counsellors there is Safety*. But whence did Mr. Rhind learn that all the Members of a *Presbyterian* Judicatory were to be supposed in all Respects Equal? Was it from the *Presbyterians*? Surely not. They willingly own, that all the Ministers, for Instance, in one *Presbytry* are not Equal in all Respects. One of them is more *Learned* than another. Another perhaps, tho' he hath not so much Learning, is yet *Wiser*, for the greatest Clerks are not always the Wisest Men. Was it from his Fellow Writers of the *Episcopal* Side? No. On the contrary, They plainly declare, that the *Presbyterians* neither plead nor suppose any such Thing. Thus the Author of the *Seventh Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity* Sect 3d. They, saith he, which cannot brook the Superiority which Bishops have

‘ have, do notwithstanding themselves admit that some Kind of Difference and *Inequality* there may be lawfully amongst Ministers. *Inequality* as touching Gifts and Graces they grant, because this is so plain that no Mist in the World can be cast before Men’s Eyes so thick, but they needs must discern through it, that one Minister of the Gospel may be more Learned, Holier and Wiser; better able to instruct, more apt to rule and guide than another? Let Mr. Rhind then say at his best Leisure, whence he got that *supposed Equality* in all Respects.

His Third Argument is taken from the Practices of the *Presbyterians* themselves, The Sum of which in his own Words p. 35. is. That, though by their Principles all Church Officers are allowed an equal Authority, yet in Effect the whole, or at least the Chief Power is in the Hands of a Few, who are the most knowing and Wise. And for proof of this he brings an Instance, how that in three several General Assemblies, though the most numerous Party in the Assembly were earnest to have the *intrinsic Power* of the Church vested by an Act, yet the Authority of a leading *Junto*, who were upon the matter so many Bishops, crushed that Dangerous Affair. Why then, saith he p. 37. do they oppose that kind of Government, which is not only indispensibly necessary in it self, but does in despite of their Principles actually obtain among themselves. Thus he. In Answer to which. How lucky so ever Mr. Rhind may be in some of his *Minutes*, yet perhaps he is the most *unlucky* in his Arguments ever Man was: They being generally so ill natured as to cut their own Throat. For 1mo. who told him that it is against *Presbyterian* Principles, that one Minister should have a greater Hand in manageing affairs than another? Not the *Presbyterians*, they refuse it. Not his Brethren the Authors on the *Episcopal* Side; Witness him last cited who tells us (*Ibid.*) ‘ A Priority of Order they deny not but that there may be, yea such a Priority as maketh one Man amongst many a Principal Actor in those Things whereunto sundry of them must necessarily concur, so that the same be admitted only during the Time of such Actions and no longer. 2do. is it indeed true, that the *Presbyterian* Government is in effect in the Hands of a Few, who are upon the Matter Bishops? Then it is certainly true, that they are not *Schismatics*, consequently that Mr. Rhind’s separating from them on that Score is unjustifiable.

justifieable. Is this my reasoning only? No, but of one of the best Men perhaps ever wore Mitre, I mean Dr. *Bedell* afterwards Bishop of *Kilmore* in his Answer to Mr. *Wadsworth* once a Minister in *Suffolk*, then a *Roman Catholick* and Pensioner of the *Holy Inquisition* in *Sevil*. *Wadsworth* in his Scripts after his Revolt tell foul upon the *Reformation* in these Words. ‘ In *France, Holland and Germany* they have no Bishops. To this Dr. *Bedell* answers (p). ‘ What if I should defend they have? ‘ because a Bishop and a Presbyter are all one, as *S. Jerom* maintains, ‘ and proves out of Holy Scripture, and the Use of Antiquity. Of which ‘ Judgment, as *Medina* confesseth, are sundry of the Ancient Fathers, both *Greek and Latine*, *S. Ambrose, Augustine, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Oecumenius* and *Theophylact*: Which point ‘ I have largely treated of in another Place. Thus he. But Mr. *Wadsworth* was an Adversary much of Mr. *Rhinda’s* Temper, not to be satisfied without Bishops superiour to Presbyters. Dr. *Bedell* therefore finds a Way to make all the Protestant Churches *Episcopal*. In *Germany* the Superintendents were Bishops. But what was to be done with *France and Geneva* where these were not? Why, saith he, there ‘ are usually certain Chief Men, that do in a Manner bear all the Sway.--- ‘ And what are these but Bishops indeed unless we shall wrangle about ‘ Names. I hope Mr. *Rhind* is here fitted with a Wedge of his own Timber. Common Sense Dictates that Superiority in Wisdom and Dexterity for managing Business attended with a due Integrity should bear Sway among all Societies, even where the Constituent Members are otherwise equal in their Character: Which amounts to no more than this, that the Weaker should follow the Counsel of the Wiser, and no other Superiority but this could the Doctor find necessary by the Word of God among Ministers. But, saith Mr. *Rhind*, ‘ Why do those whose Superior Abilities entitle them to the Chief ‘ Power, and who exercise the same in Fact, refuse to be regularly admitted to the Exercise thereof, that is plainly, to be consecrated Bishops? I answer from the excellent Lord *Falkland* who died in the Bed of Honour fighting for the Royal Martyr (q). ‘ There was ‘ once a Hen in *Æsop*, which upon a moderate Proportion of Barly laid

[p] Burnet's Life of Bishop Bedell p. 453. 454. [q] See his Speech before the House of Commons concerning Episcopacy in Rushworth's Collect. Vol. I Part III. p. 182.

' laid every Day an Egg. Her Mistress enlarging her Diet in Hopes
 ' she would proportionally encrease her Eggs, She grew so fat upon
 ' that Addition that She never laid more. Dignities and Preferments
 oftimes turn Men's Heads, blunt their Wits, or rebate the Edge of
 their Diligence. How often has it been seen that a very good *Mini-*
ster has made but a very indifferent *Bishop*? So long as they are equal
 in Authority, they know it is only their Superior Wisdom and Ver-
 tue that can entitle them to Respect from or Sway among their Bre-
 thren. This *first* excites their Spirits, and *then* keeps them on the Bend:
 But when once they are settled in the Dignity by a formal Instal-
 ment, they know that Reverence is due to their Character, how unac-
 countable soever their Conduct is. Of all sorts of *Bishops*, these are
 the most desirable whose Dignity rises and falls in Proportion with
 their real Merit and wise Managment. This puts them upon their
 good Behaviour, which is necessary for Clergy-men as well as for
 other People. And this is plainly the Case of our *Presbyterian* Bi-
 shops. To all this Mr. *Rhind* may please to add, that they refuse, and
 their Brethren will not allow them to be *consecrated* to the Dignity,
 because it is not only without Warrant, but against the Precept of our
 Lord *Matth.* 20. 25, whereof afterwards. In the mean Time Mr.
Rhind having acknowledged that the *Presbyterians* have such as are
 Bishops upon the Matter; 'tis plain He has separated from them for
 the Want of what is not *Material*. 3^{to}. As to his Instance of the *Act*
Affertory of the *Intrinsic Power*. If he had said, that the *Junto*, as
 he calls them, by *Importunity* prevailed on, or by pure Dint of *Rea-*
son perswaded the Rest that such an *Act* was either not necessary or
 not seasonable at that Time; I believe he had spoke Truth, but no-
 thing to the Purpose, because *Presbyterians* still own, that some, who
 in Point of *Authority* are only on a Levell with their Brethren, may
 yet be superior to them in the *Eccl-astical* Politicks. But to say that
 they got it crushed by their *Authority* was to be too prodigal of his
 Credit, the whole Nation knowing it to be false. 4^{to}. I know that
 Mr. *Rhind* mentioned this Instance by Way of Reflection against the
Presbyterians, and therefore I must take the Freedom to tell him, that
 the *General Assembly* has done more, even since the *Revolution*, for
 asserting the *Intrinsic Power* than all the Prelates in *Scotland* ever had
 the Courage to do. These latter, upon the Restauration of K. *Charles*

II, meanly truckled to an avowed *Erastian* Usurpation without the least Remonstrance or Reclaiming. And when the late K. *James* sent down his Proclamation of the Date *Feb. 12. 1687.* for an unbounded *Toleration*, wherein, by his Absolute Power and Prerogative Royal, he annulled and revoked the *Penal* Laws against *Papists*; the Archbishop of *Saint Andrews* and the Elect Archbishop of *Glasgow* were the second and third Persons who subscribed a Letter of Thanks to him for the said *Toleration* and *Proclamation*. The Letter bears Date *Feb. 24. 1687.* It is stuffed with the most salsome Flattery, and a Soothing of the King in those Measures which took away the Barrier of the *Protestant* Religion and at last ruin'd himself. Soun-willing were that Unfortunate Prince's best Friends to venture their Polls by giving him free and honest Counsel; when they might have possibly saved their King, and certainly their own Consciences by the doing it. The *General Assembly* on the other hand have acted a somewhat better Part: For when in the Year 1692 the Earl of *Lothian* would needs dissolve it in a very abrupt Manner, to say no Worse; the Moderator, with all due Respect to the Civil Powers, and yet with that Courage that became a Churchman possessed of the Chair in the highest Judicatorie, boldly asserted the *Intrinsic Power* even in the Face of a frowning Government, and the whole *Assembly* adhered to him in so doing. I hope then Mr. *Rbind* will see that he should have been wise in his Wrath, and not needlessly have given Occasion to such a Piece of History. 5^{to}. His Reasoning concludes alike against *Bishops* as well as the Members of the *General Assembly*; for the World does not want to know that Bishops are not always the Wisest any more than the best Men. And he himself was aware of this 'But, saith he
' p. 38, When such is the Government of the Church, that there are
' different Spheres in which Men are to act, 'tis presum'd they are cho-
' sen with Qualifications proportioned to each. But why should that
be presumed which no Man can prove, and every Man will deny? and does not he himself own, That it has too frequently happened, that
Men of inferior Abilities have attained to the highest Ecclesiastical Digni-
ties. And does not the History of the late Times confirm this? Witness *M. Wallace*, who, in the Year 1662 was preferred to be Bi-
shop of the *Isles*, though he understood not one Syllable of the Native
Language of his Diocese; yet a powerfull Recommendation and the
good

good Quality of Pliancy procured him the *Crozier*. But, saith Mr. *Rhind*, *This is not the Fault of the Constitution but of those who prefer them.* Very mannerly! And so all the Faults of the *Bishops* must be charged upon the *Prince*. But the very Constitution has been always such in *Scotland*, that it was at least a very great Hazard if ever a worthy Person was chosen. Generally Men of Merit are modest and love Obscurity; the most unworthy Persons are most forward to put in for Preferments; Courtiers, by whose Eyes and Ears the Prince must see and hear, are most ready to recommend such as are likely to be the most serviceable Tools to themselves in their Political Designs. The Prince's *Conge d'elire* makes the Election of the *Chapter* a Sham. So that upon the whole there was a Fault in the very Constitution, even though the Office had been in itself lawful.

III. Mr *Rhind* is resolved to end this Argument with one bold Stroke. 'According, saith he p. 38. to the Presbyterian Platform, the less knowing and Wise are allowed an equal Authority with those who deserve it best: An Establishment which seems to bid Defiance to Common Sense. Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear of the *Roman Senate*? 'Twas reckoned the most venerable Bench in the World; yet there did *Parity* reign in Perfection, and that notwithstanding the Inequality among the constituent Members in Point of Prudence. That fine Gentleman the younger *Pliny* giving his Friend *Arrianus* an Account of an Action before the Senate in which he had been employed to plead, tells him *. *Thus it seemed good to the Plurality: For the Votes are numbered not weighed.* **NOR CAN IT OTHERWISE BE IN PUBLICK COUNCIL,** *in which there is nothing so unequal as the Equality it self: For the Right of all is equal tho' their Prudence is unequal.* Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear of the House of *Lords* or *Commons* in Parliament? Are not all the Members in these several Houses allowed an *Equal Authority*? yet who ever said that they were *equally* qualified, or that it was necessary They should be so? If he has never travelled so far as *Westminster* in his Views, yet did he never hear of the *Lords of Session* or *Senators*

H 2

tors

* Sed hoc pluribus visum est. Numerantur enim Sententiae; non ponderantur. Nec aliud in publico Concilio potest fieri, in quo nihil est tam inaequale quam Aequalitas ipsa; nam cum sit impar Prudentia, par omnium jus est. *Plin.* Lib. ii. Ep. xii.

tors of the College of Justice in Scotland? Does he not know that none of 'em have a Negative on the Rest; that they have all an equal Authority, though they never had, nor probably ever will have equal Abilities? Yet one would be very void of Common Sense that would venture to say, that their Constitution bids a Defiance to it.

So much for his Argument from the *Nature of the Thing*, of which he is so vain, that he affirms p. 39. *it may in some Measure serve to determine the Controversy about Church Government: And I hope, after what has been said, every Reader will grant that he may for ever enjoy that good Opinion of it without fear of a Rival.*

A R T I C L E II.

*Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument for the Necessity of instituting Prelacy from the Form of Government in the Jewish Church, is Examined.
From P. 39. to P. 45.*

BEFORE I state this Argument, I must put (yet once more) the Reader in Mind, that though the *Presbyterians* are against a Subordination of *Pastors*, yet they are for a Subordination of *Officers*, as well as the *Prelatists* are. And that therefore when his Argument concludes against a *Parity of Officers*, or for a *Subordinate Form of Government*, it is only a Parcel of Empty insignificant Words huddled together, unless by the former we understand *Presbytry*, and by the latter *Prelacy*. This premised, His Argument stands thus.

‘ A Government constitute by a Subordination of Rulers was
‘ actually

' actually approved of by God under the Old Testament: For
 ' the Form of Government which by Divine Institution obtained
 ' in the *Jewish Church* was constituted by *Officers* acting in an Im-
 ' parity; *such as* the High Priest, Priests and Levites; each of which
 ' were Orders distinct from, and Subordinate to the other. p. 40.
 This is his whole *Medium*, and the only Inference that can
 justly be made from it is (which every *Presbyterian* grants) That
 such an Imparity was not only Lawfull but also best for *that State*
 of the Church. But Mr. *Rhind's* Inferences from it are of a higher
 Nature, *viz. That if it was best under that Dispensation*, he cannot
 conceive *how it can be reckoned* unlawfull in the *Christian Church*. I
 cannot but pity the Weakness of His *Conception*: For if our Lord
 has changed the *Jewish Priesthood*, and dissolved their Polity, and
 set up the *Christian* very different from it, will not this make it
unlawfull? O but, by Mr. *Rhind's* Account, our Lord did not this, he
 could not do it, it was not consistent with his Wisdom to do it, plainly,
 ' it is, *saith he*, p. 41, an Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom to
 ' think that God would alter that Form of Government which he
 ' had instituted to establish another quite different from it. And
 now you have his whole Argument, an Argument which he *thinks*
sufficient to prove the Perpetuity of that Form.

In discoursing it I shall shew, *First*. That, as he has laid it, it is
 horridly Impious. *Secondly*. That his Managment of it against the
Presbyterians is Ridiculous. *Thirdly*. That it is *in it self* Weak,
 and concludes nothing to the Purpose in this Controversie. *Fourth-*
ly. That if it conclude at all, it concludes for an Universal Papacy
 rather than a *Diocesan* Prelacy. And *Lastly*. That it is rejected as
 insufficient by the *Episcopal* Authors themselves.

I. The Argument as he has laid it is horridly Impious. God
 must not be Wise, that is, he must not be God, unless Mr. *Rhind*
 please. No Christian ought to pass that Way of talking he has
 got into without Resentment. Sauciness against the Almighty is
 Intolerable. What! Was it not consistent with the Wisdom of God
 to alter a Form of Government he had formerly instituted? Has
 Mr. *Rhind* read the *Bible*, and knows not that God governed *Is-*
rael first by Judges and then by Kings, and yet was infinitely wise
 in both? If he did this in the *State*, why should it reflect on his

Wisdom to do it in the *Church*? Nay has he not actually done it in the *Church*? For, was not both the Civil and Ecclesiastical Power Originally in the same Person, in *Adam*, the *Patriarchs*, and *Moses*; and yet under the *Law* did He not put the *Ecclesiastical* Regiment into the Hands of the High Priest, Priests and Levites, so that the King was no longer Priest? And might he not have learned this from Dr. L...y Himself (*r*)? The *Jews* fondly dreamed that their Polity was to last with the World, and persecuted the first Martyr *Stephen* to the Death, because he had taught, that *Jesus of Nazareth* would change the Customs which *Moses* delivered *Acts* 6. 14. But, if Mr. *Rhinda's* Argument is good, *Stephen's* Doctrine was False, and the *Jews* Murdering of him was only the Effect of a laudable Zeal. Is it not more agreeable to the Divine Wisdom to think, that the Circumstances of the *Church* being so vastly altered, her Government should be so too. Under the *Jewish* Dispensation the *Church* was empaled within a narrow Enclosure, but the *Gospel* was to be preached to every Creature. And is not here a fair Foundation for altering the Government? And does not the Apostle to the *Hebrews* C. 7. V. 12. lay it down for a Principle, that the Priesthood being changed, there is made of Necessity a Change also of the Law. How Impious is it then to insinuate that such a Change is inconsistent with the Divine Wisdom.

II. His Managment of this Argument against the *Presbyterians* is Ridiculous. Take it in his own Words p. 43. 'Seeing there was one of the highest Order in the Jewish Church, it follows unanswerably (taking along with you what I have said above upon this Head) that there ought to be one at least in the Christian Church. This, saith he, is enough to prove the Point against the *Presbyterians*, and I defy them if they shall answer directly to evade it. This Defiance of Mr. *Rhinda's* is the very prettiest I ever heard of. Let the *Presbyterians* take along with them what he has said above upon this Head, that is, let them grant that it is an Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom to think that God would alter that Form of Government which he had instituted among the *Jews* to Establish another quite different from it among the Christians,

stians, and then it will follow unanswerably, *that as there was one high Priest in the Jewish Church, there ought to be one at least in the Christian Church.* That is, as if he had said, *Pray, you Presbyterians, let me bind your Hands, and then I'll undertake to knock out your Brains.* I truly cannot Imagine what Class of Men Mr. Rhind wrote for. *Presbyterians* will be so far from *taking along with them* his Assertion, that they cannot otherwise look on it than as a most rude Attaque on the Divine Majesty. He goes on with his reasonings. 'I ask them, *said he* p. 44. whether it be just to condemn 'the Order as useless among *Christians*, because one is not able to 'perform all the Offices belonging to it? Or whether it be not, 'rather reasonable to acknowledge, that as there was in the Jewish 'Church, one Ecclesiastical Ruler of the highest Order, and no 'more, because one was sufficient; so should *Christians* have one 'at least and as many more as are needfull? The *Presbyterians* are heartily content with the Proposal: For, they believe every Gospel Minister to be an Ecclesiastical Ruler of the *highest* Order, and are very well perswaded that one of them is needfull in every Congregation. They are so far from being against multiplying of *Bishops*, that where there is one in *England*, they wish there were three hundred. But, *said Mr. Rhind*, 'Let them allow one Bishop for 'every District, in Proportion to that, to which the High Priest's 'Authority did extend, and the Debate is at an End. The Presbyterians will be content with this likewise upon *two* very reasonable Conditions. 1st. If he can prove that there is any *Divine* Institution appointing it to be so. But Mr. Rhind's dictating to God and thinking it *reasonable* it should be so, will not be admitted by them as a Proof of this. 2^d. If he can prove that the Ecclesiastical Rulers of the highest Order in the Christian Church are appointed for the same Functions the High Priest was under the Law. The High Priest, that I may speak in M. Dodwell's Stile, was to offer up the National or Popular Sacrifices for appropriating to the *Jews* only (whether by Birth or Profelytism, it is the same Thing) the Priviledge of the *Segallah*, and the Patronage of the Supream Being. But in all the New Testament I cannot find, that any such either National or Provincial Appropriation was ever designed to be the End of any of the Functions of any Gospel Ruler. Nay we find all on the

the contrary: For, by the Gospel Constitution, all that worship the same Supreme Being and in the same Way that he has appointed are within the Church, whatever National Distinctions they have.

III. The Argument is *in it self* weak, and concludes nothing to the Purpose in this Controversy, because from the whole Strain of the Scriptures it is plain, that the *Aaronick* Priesthood was Typical, and had at once both its End and Accomplishment in Christ. Mr Rhind was aware of this Exception, and therefore Effays to take it off by two Answers. 1st. *If the Constitution of the Levitical Priesthood was Subordinate, the Christian must be so too, otherwise the Type is not adequately represented by the Antitype* p. 42. This the Presbyterians grant: For Christ is the great *High Priest of our Profession* Heb. 3. 1. And all other Christians are a *Royal Priesthood* 1 Pet. 2. 9. Subordinate to him. But otherwise, that the Orders of the Clergy among Christians should be adjusted to these among the *Jews* is a ridiculous Dream; seeing, from the one End of the New Testament to the other, the Title of *Priest* is never given to the Ministers of the Gospel as such. His 2^d Answer is, ' That though these Parts of the Priestly Office which did prefigure the *Sacrifice* and Intercession of *Jesus Christ* were to cease upon his Crucifixion and Ascension, yet that the High Priest was also a *Governour* in the *Jewish* Church, and that the *Ordinary* Priest had a share in the Government with Him, though Subordinate to Him, and that the *Levites* were Subservient to both. And he is Confident that the Presbyterians will not affirm that the High Priest or Inferior Priests did Typify any Thing under the Reduplication of *Rulers*, or the *Levites* as under them, or that there was any Thing Typical in their Subordination as such. But this Answer is in all its Parts unserviceable, and in some of them quite Opposite to himself. For 1. We have already heard Mr. *Dobvell* declareing, That, *it is the Bishops Presidency not in the Christian Assemblies only, but in their Sacrifices which can entitle to a Principle of Unity*. Therefore Mr. Rhind destroys the Argument by abstracting from the *Sacrifices* and insisting on the Government, and by considering the *Jewish* Church Officers not as Priests but as *Rulers*. 2. If the Subordination as such among the

Jewish

Jewish Church Rulers was not *Typical*, then where is there any Necessity, by that Argument, for any such Subordination in the Christian Church? 3. Why is he so *Confident* that the *Presbyterians* will not affirm, that the High Priest or Inferior Priests did typify any Thing under the Reduplication of *Rulers*? He owns he had read the *Presbyterian Authors* with a *Scrupulous Exactness* particularly the *Altare Damascenum*. Now the Author of that Work expressly affirms it (s). 'The very *Eminency*, saith he, of the High Priest, in which the Episcopal Writers place the Order and *Eutaxy* of that Government, was *Typical*, and shadowed the *Supereminent Dignity* of our High Priest above all other Priests, whose Priesthood has an Influence on all the Faithfull, and makes them Priests and Pastors in an Ethical though not Political Sense. 'Tis then plain that Mr. Rhind's Confidence in this Point has been much greater than his Caution. 4. Seing under the *Jewish Dispensation* the *Ordinary Priests* had a Share in the Government with the High Priest, Why did not Mr. Rhind tell us what Share the *Ordinary Priests* in the Church of England have with their *Diocesans* or High Priests in the Government? I cannot find it, No wonder truly, for the great *Bacon Lord Verulam* could not. This is one of the Things wherein, he confesses, he could never be satisfied, viz. the *Sole Exercise* of their Authority. 'The Bishop, saith he (t), giveth Orders alone, excommunicateth alone, judgeth alone. This seems to be a Thing almost without Example in Government, and therefore not unlikely to have crept in, in the *Degenerate and Corrupt* Times. Thus he. Where is then the Subordination in Government which Mr. Rhind pleads for?

IV. His Argument, if it conclude at all, concludes for an Universal *Papacy* rather than a *Diocesan Prelacy*: For there was but one High Priest over the *Jews*, and consequently there should be but one Supreme Bishop over the *Christian Church*. And indeed Mr. Dodwell has roundly asserted, that the Original Government of the Christian Church was a *Papacy*. That the whole Christian Churches

I

were

(s) Alt. Damasc. p. 140. Sed cum sancti omnes sint Deo sacerdotes, annon illa ipsa EMILIANI tumini sacerdotis in qua illi ponunt O. d. m. & Eutoxiam, TYPICA fuit, & SOLI EMILIANI tumini pontificis nostri supra alios omnes sacerdotis DIGNITATEM adumbrabat, ejus sacerdotum in omnes fideles influit, & Ethnicos, licet non politicos in externo regimine sacerdotes & altiores facit? (t) Certain Considerations touching the Church of England, p. 14.

were subject to the Church at *Jerusalem*, and that the Bishop of *Jerusalem* was the Principle of *Catholick* Unity, and that there were no other Bishops in the World but himself, and that the settling of Bishops in particular Diocesses was an Aftergame. This is *M. Dodwell's* Doctrine. (v). And it agrees very well with the Argument from the *Jewish* Priesthood. He indeed took Pains to prevent the Consequence that this Doctrine might seem to have in Favour of the Church of *Rome*, by teaching, as we shall hear afterwards, that the Government was altered in the *Second* Century; but *Mr. Rhind* by declaring an *Alteration* Inconsistent with the Wisdom of our Lord, has plainly betrayed the *Protestant* Cause. He foresaw that this Objection would be made against his Argument. Let us hear how he wards it off. *This Cavil*, saith he, p. 43. *is, I confess very Plausible, and our Adversaries do triumph upon it as unanswerable; but they do not perhaps know whom they oblige by this.* Well, pray who are they? *Let me tell them*, saith he, *That the Roman Catholicks are no less fond of it than they.* But let me tell *Mr. Rhind*, that this is to write not only weakly but ridiculously. When the *Prelatists* go in to the worst Part of *Popery* by insisting on an Argument which, supposing its Solidity, must needs found the *Pope's* Supremacy, must not the *Presbyterians* (who have proved a hundred Times, that 'tis absurd to infer the Form of Government in the *Christian* from that of the *Jewish* Church) tell them so much for fear of obliging the *Roman Catholicks*? This is a new Way he has got of turning the Chace, which may be admired, but, I believe, will scarcely be followed by any Wise Man. But after all this, how does he defend his Argument against the *Papists*? He indeed refers his Reader to the *Authors* who have managed this Controversy against them; but his own Defence is absolutely Naught. 'Tis this p. 43. 'In so confined a Society as was the *Jewish* Church, any more than one Officer of the highest Order was needed; less; seeing the People could easily repair to him, from the remotest Corners of *Judea*, upon all the proper Occasions; and one was sufficient

(v). *Parænes*, Sect. 6 p. 9 *Ecclesie Catholice universæ, primum tenui Episcopo Hierosolymitanus. Patrem illi quæm similiter tenuit pontifex terphi Hierosolymæ in Judea in Synagoga Judæorum per orbem terrarum ubique dispersas. Et patrem illi quæm ubi vendicatur per Christianam orbem universum Pontifex Romanus.*

cient for the Discharge of all the Duties of that Office. But since the Partition Wall is broken down, the Church is become a Society of so large an Extent, that all the Faithfull cannot have Access to one, nor can one serve all the Purposes of that Office. But why may not one serve all the Purposes of that Office, now, as well as during the whole first Century and a Part of the second according to M. Dodswell? 'Tis true the Professors of Christianity are more numerous now than they were then: Yet not more widely dispersed. For if we may believe Antiquity, Christianity got considerable footing in the Apostles Days even in the Nations most remote from Jerusalem the Center. And that S. Andrew, S. Simon the Canaanite, and as some say, S. Paul himself planted the Gospel in Britain. And if the Bishop sitting at Jerusalem, could be a Principle of Unity to us then, why might not the Bishop of Rome, who is much nearer hand, be so to us now? Let Mr. Rhind satisfy the Roman Catholics, how, for Instance, all the Faithfull in the Cities of London and Westminster amounting to about a Million of Souls, how all the Faithfull in the rest of Middlesex, Essex and Part of Hartford Shire on this Side the Globe, how all the Faithfull in the forreign English Plantations on the other Side the Globe and in both the Indies can have Access to the Bishop of London their Diocesan, or how he can serve all the Purposes of that Office to them. Let Mr. Rhind, I say, satisfy the Roman Catholics in this; and then I believe they will find it no hard Matter to shew how all the Faithfull through the World may have Access to one Pope at Rome, and how one Pope alone may serve all the Purposes of that Office to the Church Universal. 'Tis plain then that Mr. Rhind's Argument must needs infer the Necessity of the Pope's Supremacy.

V. His Argument is rejected as Insufficient by the Episcopal Authors themselves. It will be enough to establish this from the Mouth of two Witnesses. The first is Bishop Bilson (x) 'From these superior and interior Degrees, saith he, amongst the Priests and Levites under Moses, haply may no necessary Consequence be drawn to force the same to be observed in the Church of Christ. First, For that the Tribe of Levi might not be unguided without manifest Confusion, and was not subjected to the Regiment of any other

“other Tribe, but had the same Manner of Government by her
 “Prince, Elders, Judges and Officers over Thousands, Hundreds,
 “Fifties and Tens. And afterward this Preeminence grew unto
 “them according to their Families by Inheritance and Birthright.
 “The Father was Chief of his Offspring whiles he lived and after
 “him his Eldest, *which is no Way imitable in the Church of Christ.* Thus
Bilson.

A Second Witness is the famous *Stillingfleet* a much greater Man
 than *Bilson*. He not only asserts (y) but proves irrefragably that the
 Christian Church was formed not upon the *Temple* but the *Synagogue*
 Model; where there was no such Thing as a Hierarchy, but a Ru-
 ler of the Synagogue one or more, with a *Primacy* in Point of Or-
 der, but an *Equality* of Power with the rest of the Elders of the
 Synagogue. Mr. *Rhind* then, ere his Argument can hurt the Pres-
 byterians must both answer the *Reasons* and refuse the *Authority*
 of his Brethren and Fathers.

And thus I have done with this Argument; And cannot but wish,
 that the *Episcopal* Writers of the *New cut* were somewhat less *Jewishly*
 given. They are not content to plead for a *Jewish Government* in
 the Church, but have turned also our *Communion Tables* into *Altars*,
 our *Ministers* into *Priests*, and the *Communion* into a *Propitiatory*
Sacrifice; yea M. *Dodwell* (z) has found the Ancient Bishops
 wearing the *Sacerdotal Frontlet* in Imitation of the *Jewish High Priest*.
 Yea he has found † their Succession *Hereditary*. Who knows where
 the Humor may stop? If they go on at the same Rate, 'tis to be fea-
 red they may turn Christianity into somewhat more than a *Mystical*
Israelitism, and revive upon us the old *Controversy*, that except
we be circumcised, we cannot be saved.

(y) *Irenic. Part II. Chap. vi.* (z) *One Priesthood Chap. ix. Sect. 4.* † *Ibid. Sect. 5.*

A R T I C L E III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument for the Necessity of instituting Prelacy from the Rules of political Prudence in Compliance with the Jews and Romans, is examined. From P. 45. to P. 49.

THIS is an Argument which, as Mr. Rhind has discoursed it, is, I dare affirm, a pure Original Piece ; and that as no Man ever used it before him, so no Man readily will after him. The Summ of it is. The Jews were Zealous for their *Hierarchy*, the Romans were under a *Monarchy*. A Parity of Officers or levelling kind of Government (such as he, with equal Justice and Accuracy, supposes the Presbyterian to be) would have quite alienated the Jews from, and raised the Jealousie of the Romans against Christianity. Therefore it was not Consistent with the Wisdom and Goodness of our Lord and the Inspiration of his Apostles, who became all Things to all Men, to provoke their Aversion by determining against their Inclinations p. 46. And if they had Institute such a *Republican* Form as the Presbyterian is, their doing so would have justified the Persecutions were raised by their Enemies against them. For, saith he, p. 47. would they be justly blamed, if, for their own Security, they should endeavour to Crush a Society of so dangerous a Constitution. And therefore he leaves it to the Consideration of all Wise and Impartial Readers, whether it be not a Thought too unworthy to be entertained of Christ and his Apostles, that They should have given Occasion to so reasonable a Jealousie, and

‘ and exposed Christians to Persecution, upon an Account about which they might have Innocently agreed with Their Enemies.

Here is indeed a masterfull Stroke. Here is Infinite Wisdom limited and Infinite Freedom confined in the most Effronted Manner. All the Business of the Sons of Men is to know what Government Christ and his Apostles actually did establish, and upon finding that, to take it upon Trust that it was the very Best. But to prescribe, what Government Christ and his Apostles were obliged in *Prudence* to Establish, is Presumptuous in the highest Degree. But waving this, let us try whether his Premises will infer his Conclusion.

I. As to the *Jews*. They were *Zealous* for their *Hierarchy*. Ergo, saith Mr. Rhind, Christ and his Apostles institute one too, because it would have been disobligeing to them to institute *Presbytry*. But is it not much more reasonable to argue the quite contrary Way, viz. That because the *Jews* were *Zealous* for their *Hierarchy*, therefore Christ and his Apostles did not institute one; because if they had, it would have exasperated the *Jews* to the greatest Height, and provoked them to rivile the Christians as *Schismatics*, yea to curse them as they did the *Samaritans* for setting up Altar against Altar? Yes, this is so very obvious to common Sense, that M. Dodwell, (a) Himself gives it as the Reason, why during the first Times of the Apostles they did for a while forbear the Setting any Bishop up in any considerable Superiority over his Brethren. ‘ For, saith he, if this Superiority of the Bishop were a Substituting him in the Place of the *High Priest*, and the Multiplying such Superiors in several Cities were the multiplying *High Priests* in several Cities; it plainly appears how this must have been interpreted by those who were *Jewishly* affected, from the Principles already mentioned. They must have looked on such Persons as not only *Violators of their Law*, but as *breakers of their mystical Union*, and consequently obnoxious to the same *Curses* and *Execrations* which on the same Account had been thundered against the *Samaritans*. Thus he. Yea, he tells us else-

[a] One Priesthood Chap. IX. Sect. 7. p. 248.

elsewhere (b), that Christ was so far from instituting a *Hierarchy*, that he did not so much as intimate to his Disciples that ever any *Hierarchy*, distinct from the *Jewish* which already obtained, was to be set up; yea, that if he had intimate any such Thing, the Disciples themselves had been in Peril of Revolting from him on that very Account. I hope then we are in no great Hazard from the *Jews*.

II. As to the *Romans*. 'Tis True they were under *Monarchy*. Ergo say I. 1^{mo}. Such a Constitution in the Church as made every Bishop a *Monarch* in his own City; and raised him to a *Throne* (I hope Mr. Rhind knows the *Episcopal* Stile) would have heightened their Jealousie and provoked their Indignation against the Christians. For, tho' our Lord disclaimed all meddling with Secular Affairs, and at length became invisible; upon which Accounts the *Romans* had no just Reason to be in any Apprehension from himself; yet who knows not that *States* are Jealous even of the smallest Appearances? Was it not Christ's being called *King of the Jews* that stung *Herod* so sharply that he sought to murder him in his Cradle? Was it not on the same Pretence that *Pilat* condemned him in Judgment, when he had acquitted him in his Conscience? If they were thus Jealous of a Monarch who owned His *Kingdom not to be of this World*, and was shortly to leave it; would they not have been much more so if a visible Monarch, *Independent of the State*, had been set up in every City? And has not the Event shewed that they had had Reason for such Jealousie, when Bishops in most Kingdoms have made such Encroachments on the Civil Government, and the Bishop of *Rome* has set his Foot on the Necks of the greatest Emperours. And does not Mr. Dodwell himself confess, (c) That it was the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, upon whom, as he fancies, all the Christian Churches through the World did depend, that provoked the *Gentiles* to Rage so much in Persecution against that Church, that the Head being once lopt off, Christianity might be ruined at once. 2^{do}. If a *Prelatical* Form of Government would have any Way recom-

(b) *Parænes. Sect. 14. p. 58. 3.* (c) *Parænes. Sect. 16. p. 67.* Suspicio hoc tunc adeo in Ecclesiam Hierosolymitanam fuisse Grævis, ut, a capite sublato, res Christiana universa una consideret.

recommended the *Christian Church* to the Favour of secular Princes, or even alleviate their Spire against Her, Is it not strange that none of the *Apologists* for *Christianity* ever insisted on that Topick? Is it not strange that the younger *Pliny*, (d) who gave the Emperour so Discreet an Account of the Christians, never mentioned how well their Government was suited to that of the Empire? 3to. Why should Mr. Rhind Imagine that a *Parity of Officers* would appear any uncouth Thing to the Romans: For, had they not a Couple of *Consuls* of equal Dignity chosen annually? Nay, did it not shortly after this grow in use to have a Couple of *Emperours* (sometimes moe) reigning with consent, *Æquo Jure* as *Eutropius* (e) expresses it. So far were they from having an ill Opinion of Parity. 4to. Does not Mr. Rhind know that most of all the brave Spirits among the Romans in the Apostles Days secretly groaned under the imperial Chains; impatiently longed for, and sometimes bravely attempted the Recovery of their ancient Liberties and Government? Does he not know that upon the Death of *Caligula* the Senate decreed that the Memory of the *Cæsars* should be extinguished, and the Temples built to their Honour thrown down, and that, by the *Tribune* of the People they Discharged *Claudius*, who had been saluted Emperour by the Army, to enter on the Administration, though indeed they were at last overpowered by a military Force? If therefore we were to reason on such Common Place Arguments, 'tis plain that a *Monarchical* Form of Government in the Church would have most excited the Jealousie of the *Prince*; and that a *Republican* Form would have gained her most Profelyts among the *People*.

But, saith Mr. Rhind p. 48, we do not find that ever their Persecutors did charge it upon them as a Crime, that the Church was of a Republican Constitution. True indeed they did not: For they knew that the Christians owned Christ as their Head and King, and on that Account misrepresented them as Rebels and Seditious Persons, and raised Persecution against Them. *Judeos* (saith *Sueton*) (f) *Impulsores Chresto assidue tumultuanes Roma expulsi*.

But

But I have insisted too long against an Argument the most Maggorish was ever bred in the Head of a Liveing Creature. I doubt not but the Reader is Curious to know what could put him upon it. The Discovery of this is no hard Matter. 1mo. It was even pure Love to the *French King*, that he might Justifie Him in all his Barbarous Usage of his *Protestant* Subjects. Who could have blamed the *Roman* Emperours, if, for their own Security they had crushed the *Christian Church*, in Case her Government had been *Presbytry*? This is his *Doctrine*; and is not the Use of it very obvious, viz. The Government of the *French Protestant Churches* was *Presbytry*; who then can blame His most *Christian Majesty* for Crushing a Society of so dangerous a Constitution? 2do. It was to teach our own Princes at Home how they are in all Time coming to treat us. We are *Presbyterians*, and *Presbytry* alone is a reasonable Ground of *Jealousie* and just Cause of *Persecution*. Thus Mercifull and Gospel-like is the *Prelatick Spirit*. But I go on.

S E C T. V.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Proofs for evincing that Prelacy actually was instituted, are examined. From P. 50. to P. 119.

MR. Rhind p. 40. falls a Haranguing with a very disdainfull Air, which yet becomes a High-Flyer admirably well. 'A Government, saith he, constitute by a Subordination of Rulers is actually approven of by God, and this he has so fully notified in his Word, that to prove it, I am not put to the wretched Shift of obtruding upon my Readers any remote Consequences fetched from

‘two or three controverted Texts, as the Adversaries in this Case are obliged to do.’ Tis very true that a Hierarchy under the *Jewish* Dispensation was both institute and approved of by God: And how very serviceable to the Cause of Prelacy this is, I believe the Reader is by this Time sufficiently convinced. But now he resolves to rally his Forces and attempts to prove the *Actual Institution* of Prelacy by *six* Arguments, the first four whereof are pretended to be ferched from the Scripture. And no doubt his Reader is in great Expectation: For, after the Harangue you have heard, would not a modest Person be tempted to think, that Prelacy were so legible in the Bible, that one needed only open his Eyes to find it there? And yet ’tis *Mathematically* certain it is not there. How *Mathematically* you’ll say? Why the Incomparable Mr *Dodwell*, who has stated the Controversie fairly, whose Authorities are Pertinent and justly alledged, and whose Deductions from them, and all his other Reasonings do proceed in a *Mathematical* Chain, has frankly owned (g) it is not there. Plainly, that Prodigy of Learning has acknowledged, That ‘it is not needful that the Form of Government to be now observed, should have been delivered in the Canonical Scriptures; That there is no Place of them which openly professes that; That there is none of the Sacred Writers treat of Church Government on Design. *Nay* that the Holy Ghost has never described any one Form of Government that was to take Place every where and at all Times. Mr *Rhind*’s Attempt then was too hardy; and he was too desperate to undertake that which the ablest Champion *Prelacy* ever had owns to be impossible to be done. And now I come in so many *Articles* to examine his *Proofs*; and ’tis a Lucky Presage that they will not be very dangerous, seeing We are sure neither to be oppressed

(g) Parænes. sect. 14. p. 57. Opus non est ut regiminis Ecclesiastici omnia lode observanda adita fuerint in scripturis canonicis. Nullus enim est qui id preficiatur aperte sacri scriptoris locus. Et ne quid in illis qui ita de regimine ap. Ecclesiastico curam id volui et scriptor, aut scriptoris Auctor spiritus sanctus, ut totam etiam aliquam Regiminis ubique & in omnia Avimda uti describere, Niquam scriptoris si erit satis expre adde antiqua latura erit in Regimine Ecclesiastice mutatio cum primis, discedant a lynch parum Communitate Ecclesiæ. Nūq am satis aper quant in denis conc: uti tuc si it. sanct peronalibus, quoniam vicissim, locis, & officiis. Nūquam Officia tos extraordinarios qui in lo lculo finem habitari erant ab ordinatis satis accurate fecerunt.

pressed with M. *Dodwell's* Authority, nor straitned with his Reasonings, but on the contrary will find him frequently helping us to answer M. *Rhind*.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for the Institution of Prelacy from its obtaining in the Days of Christ, is Examined. From P. 50. to P. 61:

MR *Rhind* in Discourſing this Proof proceeds in the following Method. I. He attempts to reaſon his Reader into a Belief that Chriſt as Monarch of the Church *behoved* to inſtitute Officers of different Orders under Himſelf, by which we muſt either ſuppoſe him to mean *Prelacy*, or elſe his Argument concludes nothing againſt the *Presbyterians*. II. He adduces the Inſtance of the *Twelve* Apoſtles ſubordinate to Chriſt, and the *Seventy* Diſciples inferior to them in the Government of the Church. III. He labours with great Induſtry to prove that the Text *Matth. 20. 25. The Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe Dominion &c* with its Parallels carries in it no Inſinuation in Favour of *Presbyterian Government*; and that *much leſs can its Inſtitution be inferred from it*. All this I ſhall examine in Order.

I. He attempts to reaſon us into a Belief that Chriſt as Monarch of the Church *behoved* to inſtitute *Prelacy*. This he does by aſking two Queſtions. Firſt, aſks he, *After what manner was the Church Governed in the Days of Chriſt?* I anſwer, after no Manner at all. I doubt not but this Anſwer will ſurprize him, but I am

sure to convince him 'tis a good one. Hear M. Sage (b) 'It is obviously observable in the Evangelical Records that the Christian Church was not, could not be founded till our Lord was risen, seeing it was to be founded on his Resurrection. Is not this plain Sense and Truth too? and if the Christian Church had no Being before Christ's Resurrection, then certainly no Government; if no Government, then certainly not *Prelatical* Government, and consequently M. Rhind's Argument is lost to all Intents and Purposes. 'Tis clear as Light, that such as lifted themselves with Christ in the Days of his Flesh were under no distinct Government but that of the *Jewish* Church with which they were still incorporate, and from which, as we have already proved, no Consequence can be drawn for the Nature of the *Christian* Government. 'Tis Plain then that all further Consideration both of M. Rhind's Reasonings and Instance are utterly Needless.

But short Answers cut one's Houghs, and are apt to be very provoking. Wherefore, that his Harrangue may not be lost, I shall answer his Question according to his Heart's Wish viz. That *Our Blessed Lord himself was its sole King and Head*. And if this will content him for making the Government of the Church Monarchical, I dare promise him no *Presbyterian* will contradict him. But then, upon his Concession, he has a second Question to ask.

Was there ever a Government of a Monarchical Constitution, where the Monarch did not, yea, *behooved* not to derive of his Authority in an orderly *Gradation* upon several *Subordinate* Ministers? You see here good Reader M. Rhind's Modesty, But was Christ under the same Necessity with other Monarchs? O yes, *Shall we suppose*, saith he, *that he who is King in Zion shall do otherwise in His Church, than all wise Princes have ever done in their Kingdoms?* So now you have Mr. Rhind's Heart. Christ, the *Wisdom of God*, must take his Measures from the *wise Princes* of the Earth. But what though all this were True; that not only all the *wise Princes* of the Earth, but even our Lord Himself not only had, but *behooved* to derive of their Authority in an orderly *Gradation* upon several *Subordinate Officers*; and that a Parity of *Rulers* under

under a Monarch would make a *Monstrous*, and in it self a *Contradictious* Constitution, how would this affect the *Presbyterians*? For tho' they deny, that Christ while on Earth institute a Subordination of *Officers*, and have a very good Reason for it, as we shall just now hear, yet they both plead for and actually exercise a Government by Subordinate *Officers*. And I hope 'tis very easie to conceive how a Thing may be not only of *Scripture* in the General, but even of *New Testament* Institution, which yet was not Instituted by Christ while he was upon Earth. 'Tis then evident that Mr. *Rhina's* Reasoning, suppose it had no other Faults, yet imports nothing against the *Presbyterians*.

But, if Mr. *Rhina* please, let us abstract from what Christ *behooved* to do, and consider what he did. I affirm that while he was upon Earth he was so far from Instituting Subordinate *Pastors*, that he did not so much as institute Subordinate *Officers*. And this brings me to Mr. *Rhina's* Instance.

II. He adduces the Instance of the *Twelve* Apostles Subordinate to Christ, and the *Seventy* Disciples Inferior to them in the Government of the Church. 'Tis needless to spend Words on it. Let us see if the *Episcopal* Authors have not fitted him with an Answer.

The first is Dr. *Whitby* a late fresh Writer. 'Whereas, *saith he, (i)* some compare the Bishops to the Apostles, the Seventy to the Presbyters of the Church; and thence conclude that divers Orders in the Ministry were instituted by Christ Himself. It must be granted that the Ancients did believe these two to be divers Orders, and that those of the Seventy were Inferior to the Order of the Apostles; and sometimes they make the Comparison here mentioned: But then it must be also granted, that *this Comparison will not strictly hold*; for the Seventy received not their Mission as Presbyters do from Bishops, but immediately from the Lord Christ, as well as the Apostles; and in their first Mission were plurally sent on the same Errand *and with the same Power*. Thus Dr. *Whitby*.

The Second is M. *Sage*. 'Our Martyr *Cyprian*, *saith he, (k)* (as
' appears

appears from his Reasonings on divers Occasions) seems very well to have known, and very distinctly to have observed, that the Apostles themselves got not their Commission to be Governours of the Christian Church till after the Resurrection. And no wonder, for this their Commission is most observably recorded *John* 20. 21. 22. 23. No such Thing *any where* recorded concerning the Seventy. Nothing more certain, than that that Commission which is recorded *Luke* 10. did constitute them only temporary Missionaries and that for an Errand which could not possibly be more than temporary. That Commission contains in its own Bosom clear Evidences, that it did not instal them in any standing Office at all, much less in any standing Office in the Christian Church, which was not yet in Being when they got it. Could that Commission which is recorded *Luke* 10. any more constitute the LXX standing Officers of the Christian Church, than the like Commission recorded *Matth.* 10. could constitute the Twelve such standing Officers? But it is Manifest, that the Commission recorded *Matth.* 10. did not constitute the Twelve Governours of the Christian Church; otherwise what need of a new Commission to that Purpose after the Resurrection? Presumable therefore it is that *S. Cyprian* did not at all believe that the Seventy had any Successors, Office Bearers in the Christian Church, seeing it is so observable that *they themselves received no Commission to be such Office Bearers.* Thus *M. Sage.* And what now is become of the *Orderly Gradation.* The Apostles themselves were not constitute Governing Officers before Christ's Resurrection, How then could the Seventy be inferior to them in the Government of the Church?

And thus now we have heard *Mr. Rhind's* whole Proof of the obtaining of *Prelacy* in the Days of Christ: For not one Instance or Declaration more has he for this Purpose. Yea indeed he is so Ingenuous *p.* 53. as to disclaim a *positive* Institution; and only pleads *p.* 61. that the Subordination, which obtained among the *Twelve* Apostles and *Seventy* Disciples, declares what Form of Government Christ liked best, and consequently is a *Precedent Equivalent* to an Institution. And We have heard that there was no such *Subordination*, and that therefore it can be no *Precedent.*

But

But Mr. Rhind is resolved to be equal with the *Presbyterians*, and to make it good that there is no *positive* Institution of *Parity* in the Four Gospels.

III. He labours with great Industry to prove that the Text *Matth.* 20. 25. 'The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion &c with its *Parallels*, carries in it no Insinuation in Favour of *Presbyterian* Government; and that much less can its Institution be inferred from it. For my own Part, I cannot find any one *Presbyterian* Author that ever insisted on the said Text for a *Positive* Institution of *Presbytery*, but they urge it as an express Interdiction of *Prelacy*; and from thence in Conjunction with other Scripture Warrants infer, that, by *Scripture* Institution, the Government of the Church should be *Presbyterian*. But by no means will Mr. Rhind allow that the said Text has the least Aspect that Way; and he affirms p. 55. That the Intent of it is to correct the *Disciples* Mistake concerning the *Temporal Kingdom of the Messias*, and to warn them against *Pride and Tyranny*, but not at all to forbid a *Subordination of Officers, Pastors*, he should have said. Now that I may do Mr. Rhind Justice; I shall consider every Thing he has advanced for wresting this Text out of the *Presbyterian's* Hands.

1. *It seems*, saith he p. 53, to favour an Equality, but be it known to you others have made use of it with much more reason to prove a *Preeminence*. The Reader, no doubt, will be in Pain to know who these others may be. Plainly 'tis *Bellarmin*, who from thence attempts to prove the *Pope's* Supremacy; with as much Reason no Doubt, as he does the Lawfulness of denying the Cup to the Laity from these Words *Drink ye all of it*.

2. *There are no other Texts*, saith he *ibid.* in the four Gospels which the *Presbyterians* do, that I can remember, so much as alledge to this Purpose. But here his Memory has failed him: For if he had consulted *Didaclaus* or *Stillingsfleet* † he might have found another Text, viz. *Matth.* 18. 15. *Tell the Church*; which the *Presbyterians* insist on to the same Purpose with the former.

3. The learnedest Authors of that Perswasion, saith he p. 54. candidly own, that the Equality which they contend for cannot be
in.

† *Alt. Damas*, Cap. IV. p. 142. — *Irenic*, Part II. Chap. V.

‘ferred from this Place. Well, who are these *learnedest Authors*? He instances M. Pool. But why does he mention him? He answers, ‘because he is of so great Authority with them at this Time. Well, shall the *Presbyterians* consult him? By all means, and saith he, ‘they will be convinced that I have done him no Injustice. But what Book of his shall they consult? *The Annotations*, saith he, *which pass under his Name*. Now, good Reader, M. Pool was Dead and Rotten ere these *Annotations* were written. Plainly it was Dr. Collins wrote them, who was indeed a *Dissenter*, though I have not yet heard whether he was a *Presbyterian*. But whatever he was, he was very much inferior in Abilities to M. Pool. Are not *Presbyterians* now mightily straitned with M. Pool’s Authority.

4. They are the *lesser Presbyterian Authors*, saith he *ibid. by whom it is still insisted on*. I am truly sorry that Mr. Rhind should so frequently shew himself unacquainted with the Writers on both Sides, after he had told he had read them with a *Scrupulous Exactness*; or which is much worse, that he should so often bid Defiance to the Sincerity which the Nature of his Composition required. Calvin, Beza, Chamier, Cartwright, Didoclarvius, Turretine, the Belgick, the English, Diodati’s Annotations do all of them, besides Scores of others, assert that not only the tyrannical Exercise, but a Dominion or Prelacy it self is thereby forbidden to the Pastors of the Church. Were these the *lesser Authors*? But why do I mention them? The *English* Divines themselves from that very Text prove the Pope’s Supremacy to be unlawfull by what humble Methods soever attain’d to, or with what Moderation soever exerced. And how the Pope’s Supremacy should be unlawfull by Vertue of that Text, and yet the Supremacy of the Primate of all *England*, who is *alterius Orbis Papa*, not be so; it will be hard to give a Reason, except that which the Lord Falkland in his forementioned Speech has suggested *viz. That they oppose the Papacy beyond Sea, that they may settle one beyond the Water*. Hear Dr. Whitaker. *It is not*, saith he, *(1) Humility in the Domination that is required, but the very Domination it self that is forbidden*. And then goes on answering the Criticisms advanced by Mr. Rhind, but whercof Bellarmin was the true Father. The Church

of

of *England* Divines, to give them their Due, have oftimes made a Noble Stand against the Church of *Rome*. No wonder, They had both Truth on their Side, and considerable Dignities to lose in case they got the Worse. But of all Men in the World they are the most to be pityed when they have to Dispute against the *Presbyterians*, for the very same Arguments wherewith they defeated the *Romanists*, with the very same *Presbyterians* defeat them; whereby they make the exact Moral of the *Goose* in the Fable which was wounded with an Arrow feathered from her own Wing. 5. *The Original Word*, saith he p. 56. *which our Translators have rendered To exercise Authority* (*Dominion* he should have said) *does properly signifie such an exercise of it as is Tyrannical*; which he endeavours to prove First from *Beza*, Secondly from the *Septuagint*, Thirdly from *S. Luke Acts* 19. 16. *which*, saith he, *is the only other Place where it occurs in all the New Testament*, and certainly implies *Violence and Tyranny*, being used to signifie how the *Demoniack* overcame the Sons of *Sceva*. Now let us examine this. In the First Place, *Beza*, on that Place, is not Criticizing on the Word, or telling what it naturally imports, but is Describing the actual Practice of the Princes of the *Gentiles*. And expressly saies (*m*) ' That our Lord there dehorts ' that none amongst the Ministers of his Word seek Preeminence ' and Power. Secondly, As for the *Septuagint*, he has produced no Place where they take the Word in such an ill Sense. 'Tis none of my Business therefore to consider where they do so; but this is certain that they frequently use it in a good Sense. For Instance *Gen.* 1. 28. *Have Dominion over the Fishes of the Sea.* *Psal.* 72. 8. *He shall have Dominion from Sea to Sea.* *Psal.* 110. 2. *Rule thou in the Midst of thine Enemies.* In all those Places the *Greek Word* used by Them is the same with that in the Text. But will any Body say that *Adam's*, *Solomon's* or *Christ's* Dominion was to be Tyrannical. Thirdly, Is that Place *Acts* 10. 16. which relates the *Demoniack's* overcoming the Sons of *Sceva* the only other Place in all the New Testament where the Original Word is used? I wish some Body had helped Mr. *Rhind* to a *Greek Concordance*. For

L

I Peter

[*m*] Exhortatur ne quis inter Ministros Verbi sui quærat Præcellentiam et Potestatem. *Beza* in Locum.

1. *Peter 5. 3.* where Ministers are forbidden to carry *as Lords over God's Heritage* the Original Word is the same. Thus you see all this Criticism is quite lost. But why did not Mr. Rhind, when he was in the Criticizing Vein, observe, that though the compound Verb which *Matthew* and *Mark* use signifie sometimes *Violence* and *Tyranny*; yet that *Luke* in the Parallel Place used the simple Verb, which, however it may be sometimes applyed, yet in its own Nature signifies only *Dominion* without the Superaddition of *Tyranny* or *Violence*. Why, I say, did not Mr. Rhind observe this? The Reason is Plain, it would have made against him and quite spoiled his Argument; and why should a Man harm himself?

6. He endeavours to make good his Gloss on the Text by Criticizing on the Word *Euergetes* which our Translators render *Benefactors*. 'If, saith he p. 57, these *Gentile Princes*, whom their mean Flatterers surnamed *Euergetes*, were some of them Guilty of Violence, then doubtless the Authority, which was exercised by those who were so called is meant to be Tyrannical, and, in that Respect, 'tis that our Saviour forbids his Apostles to Copy after them. Now, that some of these who had this *Sirname* given them, did abuse their Authority to the worst of Purposes, he proves by the Instance of *Ptolemy VII. King of Egypt* surnamed *Euergetes II.* who was indeed a very ill Prince. This is a very deep Criticism. But in the First Place who shall secure us that our Saviour so much as alluded to any of those Princes that had born that *Sirname*, there being no hint thereof either in the Text or Context. 2dly, Be it that He did allude to them, yet who shall secure us, that it was to such as were ill rather than such as were good of them? But it is Nauseous to dispute against a Trifle, though there were other Princes whom their Flatterers upon Occasion now and then called *Euergetes* or *Benefactors* in a Way of Complement, yet I do not find any that bore that for their *Sirname*, save two of the Race of the *Ptolemys* in *Egypt*. And as the Second of them was very vitious, as Mr. Rhind has observed; so the first of them viz. the Son of *Ptolemy Phiadelphus* was a brave Man, engaged in a Just War against *Antiochus Callinicus* for the Murder of his Sister and her little Son, had Success in it, and in Token of his Devotion and Gratitude offered Sacrifices to the God of Heaven at *Jerusalem*. On which Account

Josephus

Josephus (n) makes honourable Mention of him. Now, when there were only two Princes that bare that *Surname*, whereof as the one was Bad, so the other was Good; why should Christ allude only to the *Ill* one? For, to affirm he did so, without proving it, is to beg the Question.

7. Mr. *Rhind* argues † from ‘ the Opposition, which our *Lord* states ‘ ‘twixt his own Example which he proposes for their Imitation, and ‘ that of the Princes of the *Gentiles* which he forbids the Apostles to ‘ follow. It cannot, *saueth he*, be said without Blasphemy, that he ‘ put himself upon a Level with his Apostles, with Respect to Au- ‘ thority and Jurisdiction; and consequently that Authority which ‘ they were to exercise, in Imitation of him, does not import, a per- ‘ fect Equality among them in Opposition to that Imparity which ‘ obtained in the Heathen Governments. The Answer is easie, Mr. *Rhind* has mistaken (whether willfully or otherwise I shall not determine) the Design of the Argument and the Way how it proceeds. For when our Lord commanded *ver. 27. 28.* ‘ Who- ‘ ever will be chief among you, let him be your Servant; even as ‘ the Son of Man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, He argued from the *greater* to the *lesser* thus: For as much as *I your Lord and Master* have humbled myself to the basest Service, there- ‘ fore *you who are indeed Servants, and each upon a Level with other*, should be ashamed to be thinking of or aspiring to be Lords and Masters over one another. This makes our Saviour’s Words Plain and In- ‘ telligible, whereas Mr. *Rhina*’s Gloss, instead of extinguishing, would have enflamed their Ambition, by supposing it Lawfull for one or two of them to Lord it over the Rest.

8. ‘ Our Lord, *saueth he ibid*, cannot be supposed to forbid in this ‘ Text such a Subordination of *Rulers* in the Church, as was that, ‘ which at that Time obtained in most of the *Gentile* States; see- ‘ ing this were to condemn that Form, by which he thought fit ‘ the Church should be governed in the Days of his Flesh, which ‘ was Monarchical. The Answer is short. 1. We have already heard M. *Sage* owning that there was no Christian Church in *Being* at that Time, consequently no Christian Governours, consequently

L 2

no

no particular Form by which the Church was then governed. 2dly, supposing both the *Twelve* and the *Seventy* had been Governours, yet we have heard Dr. *Whitby* confessing that they were both vested with the *same* Power. There being then no Subordination of Pastors, no different Orders of them under Christ at that Time, it necessarily follows that Christ's Words in the controverted Text, according to Mr. *Rhina's* Peremptory Sentence p. 61, ' Doubtless, whatever Kind ' of Government obtain'd in the Church in the Days of Christ was ' designed to be perpetual, must needs condemn such a Subordination in all Time coming.

Lastly, Mr. *Rhind* argues p. 60. That if the Sense of our Saviour's Words were not according to his Gloss, ' tis probable he would have ' stated the Opposition, not 'twixt them and the Princes of the *Gentiles*; ' but rather 'twixt them and the High Priest, Priest and Levites among the Jews. 'Tis answered. Christ had the greatest Reason to State the Opposition as he did. He had the greatest Reason *not* to State it as Mr. *Rhind* thinks probable he would have done upon Supposition of the *Presbyterian* Sense. First, he did State the Opposition 'twixt them and the Princes of the *Gentiles*, because the Disciples having a Notion of a Temporal Kingdom of the *Messias*, and being swelled with the Expectation of Dignities in the Same; our Saviour thought it needfull to answer them agreeably to the Notion they had entertain'd, and withal to insinuate to them that no one of them was to expect any Superiority over the rest in any Capacity Civil or Ecclesiastical; but that they were all to be on a Level in Point of *Authority*. And thus in Fact we find afterwards they were, though indeed on the Account of *Personal Excellencies* some of them seemed to be *Pillars*. Secondly, He did *not* State the Opposition 'twixt them and the *Jewish* High Priest, Priests and Levites, because the Disciples themselves did not yet think of any other Church Government than what at present obtained among the *Jews*, and Christ did not find them yet ripe for receiving any Intimation thereof; but thought it enough to give them a general Rule to be observed by them afterwards; and whereof, when it was to be put in Practice, they would easily conceive the Meaning, after their *Understandings* were opened, and Things brought to their Remembrance by the Holy Ghost which was to be communicated to them. This Thought is suggested to us by Mr. *Dodwell*.

well(o). 'The Apostles themselves, *saiſh he*, do not ſeem to have known any Thing concerning the Government of the Church till their Separation from the Synagogues; they were by Birth *Jews* and Zealous of the Law and Cuſtomes of their Fathers, and if our Lord before that, had revealed any Thing to them which looked that Way, that is to a *Change of Government*, they had been in Hazard of revolting from, inſtead of obeying him. And therefore our Lord dealt cauſiouſly with them, and would not put new Wine into Old Bottles, nor while their Minds were yet alienated, bear in New Revelations upon them concerning Facts from which they would have had an Aversion.

And thus now I have conſidered every Thing Mr. *Rhind* has advanced upon that controverted Text; and I hope it ſufficiently appears, that not *one* of his Thoughts, may nor *all* of them jointly are of the leaſt Force to wreat it from the *Presbyterians*, or to juſtifie the Gloſs he has put upon it: For, beſides all has been already ſuggeſted; that not only the *Tyrannical Exerciſe*, as Mr. *Rhind* would, but the *Dominion* it ſelf too, as the *Presbyterians* would, is diſcharged by that Text, is evident both from the *Occaſion* of it and likewiſe from our Saviour's *known Character*. *Fiſt*. From the *Occaſion* of it which was the Mother of *Zebeder's* Children her asking a Boon for her Sons. How earneſt ſoever ſhe might be for their Promotion; unleſs we ſhould ſuppoſe her to have been a Monster of Women, and another *Jezabel*, ſhe could not have been ſo Impudent as to ask for them a Power of *Downreering Tyrannically* over their Fellows. Could ſhe have got them raiſed to the *Dominion*, no doubt ſhe had been glad to ſee them manage it virtuouſly and with Temper and Moderation: But our Saviour would not allow the *Dominion* it ſelf, and ſo there could be neither place nor Temptation for the *Tyrannical Exerciſe* of it. *Secondly*. From our Saviour's *known Character*. He not only taught Loyalty and a Regard to the Civil Powers, but gave too a moſt bright and ſhineing Example of it in his Practice. Was it conſiſtent with this Character to repreſent indefinitely (which is much the ſame Thing

[0] Parænes. Sect. 14. p. 58. Autæ ſocetiam a ſynagoga, nec de regimine, nec de ipſo ſocetio, ipſi reſciſſe videntur Apoſtoli. Erant enim ipſi ortu Judei, patriarumq; e contrædictum legiſque itudini. Si quid autem patet illis: Dominus quid eſpectare crederetur; periculum erat ne deſiderent prius quam parent. Caute ergo egit Dominus, nec vinum novum vaſis credidit veteribus, nec promide alienis animis novas, ac factis a quibus abhorrebant, ingeſcit Revelationes.

Thing with Univerſally) the whole Princes of the Earth as a Knot of Tyrants counteracting the Deſign of their Office which is the Good and Happineſs of Mankind, by their Violence and Oppreſſion? What elſe could have been the Effect of this, but to produce in his Followers an utter Averſion to Monarchy, and to make 'em all *State-Whiggs*? This Senſe then is abſurd, and therefore ought not to be put upon our Saviour's Words. And I cannot enough wonder how Mr. *Rhind* could ſtumble upon it. Had it dropt from ſome old *Republican*, the Matter had been the leſs; but in Mr. *Rhind*, who has made Loyalty ſo great a Part of Religion, and has recommended it to the World in ſo very pointed a *Sermon*, 'twas an unpardonable Eſcape. To confirm my Thoughts upon this Text, let us hear Dr. *Whitby* on it. 'Nor do I think, ſaith he, † Chriſt only hear forbiddeth ſuch Dominion as is attended with Tyranny, Oppreſſion and Contempt of their Subjects. *First* becauſe *S. Luke* uſes only the Simple Verbs which bear no ſuch ill Senſe, *2dly*, Becauſe Kings and Governours were not always guilty of this Male-Adminiſtration. And *3dly*, Becauſe Chriſt does not oppoſe unto their Government a juſt Dominion, but a Miniſtry only.

And now upon the Whole I referr it to the Reader, if the Argument for *Prelacy* from *its obtaining in Chriſt's Days* is not even Ridiculous; when the greateſt Episcopall Writers own there was no Chriſtian Church in *Being* at that Time, therefore no Subordination of Paſtors in it, therefore no *Prelacy*. Or ſuppoſing the *Twelve* and the *Seventy* had been Church Officers, yet that they had both the *ſame* Power, and ſo it becomes an Argument for *Parity*.

† Annot. on *Matth.* XX. 23.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for the actual Institution of Prelacy from its being continued in the Days of the Apostles, and from a Succession in the Apostolate, and from its having been confirmed by Miracles, is examined, From P. 61. to P. 74.

UPON this I shall I. Examine Mr. *Rhind's* Transition, which is indeed very Remarkable. II. His general Reasonings from the *Acts* and *Epistles*. III. His particular Argument from a Succession in the Apostolate. IV. His Demonstration for the Divine Right of Prelacy from its being confirmed by Miracles.

I. I am to examine Mr. *Rhina's* Transition, which is indeed very remarkable: I mean it would be so in any other Author, though it is very familiar with Mr. *Rhind*. He, presuming he had proved That our Saviour by His Authority established the Imparity he pleads for, contends, not only that that Establishment was not Abrogate afterwards, but that even Christ himself could not abrogate it: For, saith he p. 61, *it would reflect odiously upon his Wisdom to have settled a Government, which must be almost as soon altered as instituted.* It is indeed the known Character of the Generality of the Writers on the *Episcopal* Side, that they dictate their crude Notions with the same Masterfull Air as if they were demonstrating one of *Euchia's* Propositions; yet generally this Positiveness amounts to no more than ill Manners, and therefore may either be neglected,
or

or chastised with a little Raillery. But that a Nothing of a Creature should at every Turn give Measures to the Divine Wisdom is Insupportable, and most of all in this Case. For 1st. Who that has any Reverence for our Blessed Saviour will presume to affirm that because he used one Method for constituting the Church, therefore it was inconsistent with his Wisdom to alter that Method in Governing Her when constituted? 2^{dly}. M. Dodwell, who has reasoned in a *Mathematical Chain*, has very prolixly attempted to prove (p) That the Original Government of the Christian Church not only *might* be, but actually *was* altered. Yea that the Episcopal Constitution of Government, which now obtains, is later than all the Writings of the New Testament, and therefore is not to be sought for there. If it was not inconsistent with the Wisdom of Christ to alter the Government of the Church from a *Papacy* to a meer *Prelacy*, why should it be so to alter it from *Prelacy* to *Presbytry*? 3^{dly}. Mr. Rhind himself must needs confess that the Original Government of the Christian Church is altered. For by his own Principles there were Bishops in the Time of the Apostles; for Instance, He has declared p. 78. *Timothy* and *Titus* to have been the ordinary and fixed Prelats of Ephesus and Crete. Yet the Apostles were then Superiour to them. But now all Bishops by Divine Right are Equal, and have no Superiour above them. If then it is consistent enough with the Wisdom of Christ that there should be at this Day *Bishops* without superior Apostles, notwithstanding it was otherwise at the Beginning, How is it inconsistent with his Wisdom that there should be *Presbyters* without superior *Bishops*? But then *Lastly* to compleat all, If Mr. Rhind's Assertion be true, then *Prelacy* is undone for ever. For it has been already proved from the *Episcopal* Writers of the best Note, that our Lord did not establish an Imparity, that the *Twelve* were equal among themselves, the *Seventy* among themselves, and the *Twelve* and the *Seventy* compleatly equal without any Subordination of the latter to the former. If then the *first* Institution could not be altered, Parity must obtain for ever.

II. I am to examine Mr. Rhind's general Reasonings from the *Acts* and

[p] PARMER, SECT. 13. p. 54. Hodierni Regimini Ecclesiastici Constitutio, licet emanarit ab Apostolis, cessantem scripsit N. T. omnibus recentior, & promissa non ibi expectanda. &c.

and *Epistles*. He cannot find in his Heart to enter on 'em till he have spent a Page the 62 in *Philippicks* against the *Presbyterians* for their *invincible Obstinacy* which will not yield even when he *twells Demonstrations* against them. Hard hearted Creatures they ! But Mr. *Rhine* must 'en comfort himself with this, how small soever his Success is likely to be, that yet he is in the Way of his Duty. I shall give the Reader every Word of his *Reasonings*, that he may judge whether his Party must not be (to use his own Courtly Phrase) an *Implicite Flud* indeed that keeps it self in Countenance by them. The *Acts* and *Epistles*, saith he p. 63. *favour the Presbyterians as little as the four Gospels*. Nay, if they favour them as much, they are not likely to be great Losers. 'These *Acts* and *Epistles*, adds he, are so far from intimating that 'the first Establishment was altered by the Apostles, that on the contrary they plainly shew its Continuance. Why then Adieu *Prelacy* for ever : For the first Establishment was only of the Apostles, they were the first Officers in the Church, for a while the only Officers, and still acted in a perfect Parity. ' Don't the *Acts* and *Epistles*, proceed he, all along make Mention of several Orders of Men who were undisturbedly Church Officers, that is, who were solemnly separated for Ecclesiastical Offices by the Imposition of Hands ? And don't they assign to each their Different Powers ? I answer, not *all along* ; for, as I have said just now, there was at first but *one* Order viz. that of the Apostles, and even these too solemnly separated for their Office without Imposition of Hands, at least we read nothing of it in the Scripture. What, he goes on, *does more frequently occur thro' these sacred Writings, than the Relation that is made of Presbyters and Deacons, the one Subordinate to the other, and of the Apostles Paramount to them all.* 'Tis answered. There is indeed frequent Mention of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, the one Subordinate to the other, and of the Apostles Paramount to them all, but how came he to lose *Prelats* in his Enumeration, who ought to have been inserted 'twixt the Apostles and Presbyters ? Were there none such in the Days of the Apostles ? If not, what hath the Church to do with them now ? If there were, why did he drop them in his Catalogue in this Place when he avers it afterward, tho' at the distance of 16 Pages, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were the ordinary and fixed *Prelats* of *Ephesus* and *Crete*. The Reason of this Artifice is obvious. The inserting *Prelats* here would have quite spoiled his Reasoning ; it would have made four Orders of Officers in the Apostolick Church,

viz. Apostles, Prelats, Presbyters and Deacons, and if there ought to be as many different Orders *now* as there were at *first*, which is the Scope of Mr. Rhind's Reasoning, and without which it signifies nothing; then *Prelacy* is lost: For they have but *three* different Orders among them viz. Prelats, Presbyters and Deacons, for which they do so much as pretend *Divine* Right. But to go on with Mr. Rhind's Reasonings. What though the *Acts* and *Epistles* make Mention of the different and Subordinate Orders of Apostles, Presbyters and Deacons, what follows? *Why*, saith he, *could one wish a clearer Proof than this, to evince that there was then an Imparity among Church Officers.* I answer, none. For every *Presbyterian* owns that there was *then* viz. in the Days of the Apostles an Imparity not only among the Church Officers, but Pastors too. No doubt the Apostles were superior to the *Presbyters*. But he has a *Second* Inference to make viz. 'That the same also is a most clear *Proof* that that Imparity was of Divine Institution. The *Presbyterians* grant it: For the Apostles were certainly acted by the Divine Spirit. His *Third* Inference which compleats the whole is, *that consequently that Imparity viz. of Pastors, ought to be still continued.* But here the *Presbyterians* and Mr. Rhind part Ways: for, tho' the *Presbyterians* acknowledge that the Apostles were superior to the *Presbyters*; Yet they affirm that a Superiority among Pastors is unlawfull *now*, because the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office not to be continued, the Apostles extraordinary Officers not to be succeeded to, except in the Ordinary Functions, Preaching, Dispensing the Sacraments and Governing the Church, in which they are succeeded to by every Minister. . . And this brings me to examine

III. His particular Argument from a Succession in the Apostolate. He expressly denies p. 64 &c that 'the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office, or that the Apostolick Government was Temporary, and asserts that the Bishops of the Church, meaning Prelats as superior to Presbyters, do succeed them therein. Is this true? First, Davenant Bishop of Sarum not only denies but disproves it (q), Multitudes of others of the Church of England do the same. The Church of Rome a Society of a very large Extent, of a long Standing, and such as has produced not a few Wise and Great Men expressly contradict it, denying

ing that any of the Apostles had Successors save *Peter* in the Papal Chair. *Secondly*. Which must conclude Mr. Rhind, M. Dodwell (r) Himself has denied it, and asserts that *the Office of the Apostolate failed with the last Apostle, and that never any of them had a Successor but Judas the Traitor*. Did this escape M. Dodwell through Inadvertency? He repeats it over and over and over again in different Places. But *Thirdly*, which is worst of all, *Ignatius* himself, who is both Stem and Stern of the Episcopal Cause *always* makes the Presbyters to succeed to and represent the Apostles, but the Bishops *never*. (s) 'I exhort you that you study to do all Things in a Divine Concord, the Bishop presiding in the place of God, your Presbyters in the Place of the Council of the Apostles. (t) Also be subject to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our Hope. (v) Reverence the Presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God and College of the Apostles. (x) Continue inseparable from Jesus Christ our God and from the Bishop and from the Commands of the Apostles. He that does any Thing without the Bishop and Presbyters and Deacons is not pure in his Conscience. (y) Follow your Bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father, and the Presbytry as the Apostles. I hope then this Matter is abundantly Plain, so far as human Testimony is needfull. But then *Lastly*. If to all this we add the Judgment of the Scripture, it may be put beyond Doubt. I am indeed amazed to find any Man who has read the *first* Chapter of the *Acts* of the Apostles plead for a continued Succession in the Apostolick Office. *Judas* had disposed of Himself, and the Vacancy was now to be supplied; the requisits necessary for qualifying one to stand Candidate for the Place are set down *Vers. 21. 22.* 'Wherefore of these Men which have Companied with us, all the Time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us: Beginning from the Baptism of John, unto that same Day He was taken up from us, must one be ordain'd to be a Witness with us of His Resurrection. In which Words we are plainly told that none could succeed into the Apostolate, but such as had known Jesus before His Death, and seen Him after His

M 2

Re.

[r] Desecerat cum ultimo Apostolo etiam Apostolatus officium; cum nulli unquam præterquam Judæ pro-
diori, sufficerentur Apostolorum successores. Parzenf. Sect. 6. p. 11. Sect. 15. p. 62. Sect. 16. p. 68. [s]
Ep. to the Magnes. Sect. 5. [t] Ep. to the Trall. Sect. 2. [v] Ibid. Sect. 3. [x] Ibid. Sect. 7. [y] Ep. to the
Smyrneans. Sect. 7. Edit. 1st 1693. by Dr. Wake.

Resurrection and at His Ascension. If any Man now living, Bishop or any other, can be found thus qualified, we are content He be esteem'd a Successor in the Apostolate, but otherwise it is a very shameless Thing to talk of it.

But Mr. Rhind is of a different Judgment, and therefore is resolv'd at any rate to disprove the Assertion, *that the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office, or that the Apostolick Government was Temporary.* I shall examine what He has advanced for this Purpose.

First. He will not allow it to have been extraordinary or Temporary upon any Account, because it was not so upon one particular Account, viz. *The Apostles being blessed with extraordinary Gifts.* The Reader may possibly suspect that I misrepresent Him; but take it in His own Words. 'The Apostles, saith He p. 64. were indeed blessed with sundry extraordinary Gifts, which proves them to have been extraordinary Persons; and it was highly necessary They should be such. But it does not at all follow from this, that the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office, or that the Apostolick Government was Temporary----- But who can discern the least Shadow of an Argument in this? Where is the Presbyterian who ever said that these extraordinary Gifts wherewith the Apostles were blessed are alone an Argument that Their Office was extraordinary? What Presbyterian ever denyed that Presbyters and Deacons, yea and some of the Laity were sometimes blessed with Them? The Presbyterians own these extraordinary Gifts were necessary for the successful Discharge of the Apostolick Office, They own that some of 'em were peculiar to the Apostles, particularly the giving of the Holy Ghost in His extraordinary *Charismata*; but besides these They had an *immediat Call*, an *universal Commission*, and were under an *infallible Conduct*, all which concurred to make them extraordinary Officers, and in which every Body sees They neither are nor can be succeeded to. If any one now in Being can lay claim to these Characters, we shall allow Him to be a Successor to the Apostles, and even dispense with the other extraordinary Gifts.

Notwithstanding this Reasoning of His was so ill founded, yet He goes on to harangue upon it. 'If, saith he *ibid.* the Presbyterians will have these extraordinary Gifts to be an Argument of an extraordinary Office, yet must they at the same Time grant, that

' that Office should continue as long as these Gifts were Necessary,
 ' at least as long as they actually lasted. And upon this Concession
 He attempts to prove p. 67. 68. by the Instance of *Melito* Bishop of
Sardis, *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lyons*, *Gregory* the Wonder-Worker Bi-
 shop of *Neocesaria*, *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, and by the Testi-
 mony of *Eusebius* that these Extraordinary Gifts lasted for several
 Ages; and from thence infers that consequently *Episcopacy* must
 have lasted so long. *This Reasoning*, saith He, *is good enough*, *ad*
Hominem, *and does sufficiently expose the Weakness of the Presbyterian*
Evasion. But it is neither good *ad Hominem* nor *ad Rem*, nor ex-
 poses any Thing but Mr. *Rhind's* Want of Arguments. *First* it
 is not Good *ad Hominem*: For the *Presbyterians* make no such Eva-
 sion; as we have already heard. Nor *Secondly* is it good *ad*
Rem: For the Instances of Miraculous Bishops which He has insist-
 ed on are very Injudiciously chosen. I do not deny that extraordi-
 nary Gifts were continued in the Church even down to the *Third*
 or *Fourth* Century; or longer if Mr. *Rhind* Please; but then, so
 far as relates to their having been possessed by *Bishops*, He has had
 the ill luck to pitch upon the most suspected Instances. *First* As
 for *Melito*. This was the *Euruch* who was Bishop of *Sardis*. I shall
 easily believe what *Tertullian* as cited by *S. Jerom* and *Polyrates* as
 cited by *Eusebius* say of Him viz. *That He was a Man Divinely inspir-*
ed, and in all Things directed by the Assensus and Suggestion of the Holy
Ghost, if no more be meant thereby, than that *He was a Man of ex-*
cellent Piety: For the Spirit of Christ dwells and acts in every Man
 that is Christ's: And I think 'tis plain *Polyrates* in *Eusebius* meant no
 More: For he says only that *He was led in all Things by the Grace of*
the Holy Spirit. But if Mr. *Rhind* will needs have us to understand
 thereby, that *He was in all Things under an infallible Conduct*, I assure
 Him I do not believe it: For the Apostles themselves were not al-
 ways so; even *Peter* sometimes *strewed awry*, and walked not with a
 straight Foot *Gal. 2. 14*, and I hope to make Mr. *Rhina* himself
 confess that Good *Melito* was wrong in some Things. There was a
 of *England* never keeps *Easter* upon the Day of the full Moon, but upon
 the Sunday after, when it falls upon a working Day; or that they
 seven night, when it falls upon a Sunday. But *Melito* always kept it
 after the Jewish Fashion upon the very Day of the full Moon, whether
 it

it fell on *Sunday* or *Saturday* &c. and *Polycrates* in *Eusebius* cites Him forthat very Purpose in Opposition to Pope *Victor*. 'Tis Plain then that *Melito* was sometimes Wrong, or the Church of *England* is. Mr. *Rhind* may chuse as likes Him best. Secondly, As for *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lyons*. Mr. *Rhind* saies that *He converted many Pagans in his Dioceß by the Miracles which He wrought*; but He has not instanced any of them, nor told us where the Relation of them is to be found, and I am not willing to condescend, lest I should be suspected to do it too favourably for my Self. He tells us indeed both from *Irenæus* Himself and *Eusebius* that *miraculous Gifts and Powers were very Common in His Time*; but what saies this to *Irenæus's* Share in Them? When Mr. *Rhind* is more particular I shall be so too. Thirdly, As for *Cyprian*. All that Mr. *Rhind* alledges is, that *He assures us concerning Himself that He was blessed with uncommon Measures of the Divine Spirit*, and so I believe is every Good Christian, and do think Mr. *Rhind* was very Wise in not being more particular upon *Cyprian's* Miraculous Gifts. But then Lastly, *Gregory Thaumaturgus* or the Wonder-Worker is Mr. *Rhind's* great Man, yea even a Second *Moses* for Miracles. Well, what Vouchers does He bring for them? Two indeed of a very great Name viz. *Gregory Nyssen* in the *Life of the Wonder-Worker*, and *S. Basil de Spiritu Sancto* Cap. 29. But what Credit is to be given to them? In the first place hear the great *Spanheim* (2). 'The Learned, saith He, deservedly doubt about the Canonical Epistle ascribed to the Wonder-Worker. But much more about the Prodigies and Miracles which, almost without End, are attributed to Him by *Nyssen* in His *Life* and by *Basil* Himself; whence He got the Name of the Wonder-Worker and another *Moses*. Certainly many Things in *Nyssen* breath the Credulity even of an old Wife. Thus *Spanheim*. 2dly, *Erasmus*, in the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to *Basil's* Works, rejects the latter half of His Book *de Spiritu Sancto* as Spurious, and at the end of Cap. 14. observes on the Margin, *that here the Author Changes*. Consequently the 29. Chapter which

[2.] Introd. ad Hist. Nov. Test. Sect. III. p. 332. De Epistola Canonica eidem adscripta, merito ambigunt Eucher. At multo magis de prodigijs et miraculis, propemodum sine fine, quæ illi a *Nysseno* in ejus vita, et *Basilio* ipsi hæc tribuuntur. Unde *Thaumaturgi* nomen et alterius *Mosis*. Multa certe apud *Nyssonem* antem quondam credulitatem spirant.

which Mr. Rhind insists on is of no Credit. 3dly Coke a Church of England Divine and sometime Fellow of Brazen Nose College, Oxford, proves (a) from the Body it self of that 29. Chapter that it is Spurious. And Lastly, which is worst of all, Dodwell Himself (b) reprobates these Dreams and Miracles of the *Wonder-Worker*. Was not now Mr. Rhind very well provided with Miracle-working Bishops when these were the best He could pitch on.

Secondly, Mr. Rhind having vainly spent *ten* Pages in pleading for a Succession in the Apostolate without the least Limitation, or dropping so much as one Syllable for explaining himself; at length p. 70. He tells us; that by 'the Apostolick Office, abstracting from it all 'Accidentals, *he means* that Superiority of Power with which the 'Apostles were invested in the Ordination of Inferior Church 'Officers, and in Governing them and the Church: *And pleads* 'that it was not extraordinary in this Respect; and as such to cease. But the Prelats (supposing there were *then* any such) were *Church Officers inferior* to the Apostles, the Apostles were invested with a *Superiority of Power* in the Ordination of *them*. I ask now whether that *Superiority* was Ordinary or extraordinary. If *Ordinary*, then there ought still to be Officers *Superior* to Bishops. If *extraordinary*, then the *Superiority of Power* with which the Apostles were invested in the Ordination of Inferior Church Officers, and in Governing them and the Church must be *extraordinary* too. I challenge Mr. Rhind and all his Party to take off this by a sufficient Answer.

Thirdly, He argues p. 72. 'If that Form by which the Church 'was governed in the Days of the Apostles, be in all Respects 'as good; and in many undeniably better than any other, then 'I think I may safely conclude, that it never ought to be altered. If Mr. Dodwell's Judgement be of any Weight, then this Reasoning is horribly false: For he teaches (c) That the Form of Government which obtained in the Days of the Apostles was altered, notwithstanding

[a] Censura quorundam Script. vet. p. 123. [b] Dissert. IV. in Cyr. Num. 16. [c] Passerol Sect. 59. p. 189. 181. Dum Colligentes essent et plantando Ecclesie, admodum utilis erat Primatus ille Ecclesie, Hierosolymitanus. --- Et quo litius Collegi Apostolici et Hierosolymitanam primum auctoritas (cum eam prorsus infallibilem esse constabat) eo erat etiam utilis et ad Ecclesiam omnium pulchra. Id sane docet Hieronimus, tanti per Hereticos prodire in publicum non auctor, Dum unus Ecclesie testamento Censuari, spes nulla deinde esset ut ab aliqua alia ecclesia reciperentur. --- Et quidem ad fidem propagandam, utilior erat unus ecclesie auctoritas quam aliarum omnium longe lateque Dominaretur.

notwithstanding that it was better calculate for *gathering* and *planting* Churches, for *suppressing Heresies*, for *propagating the Faith*, for the *publick Good* of all the Churches, than that which took place afterward.

Lastly. ' If, *saieth He* p. 72, the *Presbyterian* were designed to be ' the Standing Form of Church Government, it wou'd seem to ' *reflect disparagingly on the Wisdom of Christ and his Apostles*, that they ' could not make it serve all the Purposes for which such a Govern- ' ment ought to be appointed; but that to supply its Defects, they must ' usher it in with a Form, not only inconsistent with it, but which ' also in After Ages wou'd be declared an unsupportable Yoke. Is ' it to be supposed, if they had foreseen that *Parity* would be ever ' after the fittest Form of Government in the Church, or that it ' could be usefull in it, that any other wou'd have at all obtain'd? ' No. Or was there any Necessity that any other should obtain? ' Doubtless none at all. Is not this a very mannerly Herangue? Mr. *Rbind* must Discipline both Christ and his Apostles into their Duty, and teach them what was Consistent with their Wisdom, what would *reflect disparagingly* upon it. But admitting it were *mannerly*, Is there any Truth in it? No, nor one Syllable even according to the Principles of his own Master the Great *Dodwell*, according to whom the Apostles did not appoint *Several* Orders of Men, as Mr. *Rbind* alledges, for the Work of the Ministry, but *one* Order only viz. of Simple Presbyters. Plainly Mr. *Dodwell's* Account of the Matter is this, ' That the Bishop of *Jerusalem* (as we ' *have already observed*) was Primate of the Christian Church all the ' World over. That the Church of *Jerusalem* by her Itinerant Missionaries erected the whole Discipline in all the Christian World (a). ' That these Itinerant Missionaries (e) whether Apostles or others, ' were extraordinary Officers. That wherever they came, they never ordained any Bishops but Simple Presbyters only with a *Church* ' *Join* among them for Orders sake; all which had indeed a Power of

etiam in his locis colligimus, unicum fuisse, in hoc universo intervallo, Episcopum, qui in illis locis, hoc est in Hierosolymitanum. --- Primum autem tempus ubi vixere Christus et Apostoli, non erat in Ecclesia exercuerunt quam Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Missionarii, qui in locis, ubi non erant, ecclesiam procurandas, Patens; Sect. 10. p. 52. [E]tiam in his locis colligimus, unicum fuisse, in hoc universo intervallo, Episcopum, qui in illis locis, hoc est in Hierosolymitanum. --- Primum autem tempus ubi vixere Christus et Apostoli, non erat in Ecclesia exercuerunt quam Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Missionarii, qui in locis, ubi non erant, ecclesiam procurandas, Patens; Sect. 10. p. 52. [E]tiam in his locis colligimus, unicum fuisse, in hoc universo intervallo, Episcopum, qui in illis locis, hoc est in Hierosolymitanum. --- Primum autem tempus ubi vixere Christus et Apostoli, non erat in Ecclesia exercuerunt quam Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Missionarii, qui in locis, ubi non erant, ecclesiam procurandas, Patens; Sect. 10. p. 52. [E]

‘ of preaching the Word, and dispensing the Sacraments, but neither they nor their *Chairman* were to touch the Government with one of their Fingers. Plainly ‘ they had no Power to exauſtorate or depoſe any of their Number how Criminal ſoever, nor to ſurrogate new Presbyters in Place of ſuch as dyed, nor to exclude any from the Communion, nor to reſtore ſuch as had been excluded though never ſo penitent (f).

This Eſtabliſhment continued till after the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* and the Death of *Simeon* the Son of *Cleophas*. At length about the Year CVI. the Name of *Biſhop* before common to all Presbyters was appropriate to one in each Presbytry. *And this was the firſt Year*, ſaies he †, *of ſetting Epiſcopacy*.

The Biſhop thus ſet up was, if we will believe Mr. *Dodwell*, endued with a ſwingeing Power indeed. ‘ The diſpenſing all Rewards ‘ and Punishments in the Chriſtian Society was in his Hands ALONE; in his Hands was the WHOLE Government, and that ‘ Legiſlative Power that is Competent to the Church and that without a RIVAL or Mate (g). Yea ſo uncontrollable was his Power, that tho’ he might caſt himſelf out of the Church by his *Schiſm*, *Herreſe* or *Sacrificing to Idols*; in which Caſe the Epiſcopal College might ſupply his Place with another, yet it was not in the Power of that College, much leſs of his Presbyters, nay not of any Creature to depoſe him, how Immoral ſoever he were in his Life, how ill ſoever he governed the Church, but he was to be left to the Judgment of God alone (h). This was the *Ignatian*, this the *Cyprianick* Biſhop, this the Epiſcopacy that ſhou’d always obtain (i).

N

I

(f) Paræneſ. Sect. 10. p. 32. 33. Munus ſane Eccleſiarum publicis obeundis ita vacabat, ut tamen Diſciplinæ partem nullam aut Regiminiſ adminiſtrarint. Nec legimus unquam ab his Eccleſiarum Presbyteris ſeu exauſtoratos, cum ita mererentur, Presbyteros; ſeu novos in Demortuorum loca ſuſſectos. Nec pulum aliquem Communione, nec horum Presbyteriorum decieto reſtitutum.

† Ibid. Sect. 23. p. 102. Non longo, ut opinor, aberrabimus ſi Annum Conſtituti Epiſcopatus primordialeſ ſtatutum Chriſti CVI. ut ſcilicet fuerit Anno illo paulo vel Antiquior vel Recentior.

(g) Ibid. Sect. 37. p. 176. Sic penes SOLUM Epiſcopum erant ſocietatis Chriſtiæ Præmia omnia atque Pænæ. Inde ſequitur penes eundem eſſe viſibilis Eccleſiæ Regimen OMNE, Potestatemque, qualis in hac Societate locum habet, Legiſlativam. E quidem ſine AMULO.

[h] Ibid. Sect. 42. p. 192. Nec opus erat Iudice qui eum exuar, ſed quo ſolus illius ante i vacua ſuppletur. Tale Crimen erat Idolis ſacrificatio. -- Tale Crimen erat Hæreſis. -- Similis erat cauſa Schiſmatis. -- Itaque ſententia nulla opus eſt quæ illos ejiciat ex Eccleſia, vel exuat Officio. Hincque ergo nulli eſt Potestas in Epiſcopos. Sed vero nullas legimus his temporibus Epiſcoporum depoſitiones propter Crimina quæ non Potestatem iſam Epiſcopalem ſuſtulerint. Nullas propter Morum vitiâ ſola. Nullas propter Eccleſiam male adminiſtratam. [i] Ibid. Sect. 37. p. 176. Recte ergo ſine Epiſcopo Eccleſiam nequidem eſſe poſſe conſentit *Ignatius* Sect. 40. p. 186. ſupremus enim, in ſua quemque Ditione, Chriſtoque SOLI omnes Epiſcopos agnoscit ubi *S. Cyprianus*. Sect. 54. p. 240. Bono fieret Reformationis publico, ſi Epiſcopi primæviſſimum Juris reſtaurarentur.

I am fully perswaded that this *Dodwellian* Scheme, so far as it Narrates the Powers of Bishops, is the most extravagant, chimerical and false; yea indeed the most scandalous to Christianity that ever was or perhaps will be heard of; but let his Followers look to that the best Way they can: Only 'tis plain that, so far as M. *Doawell's* Judgment or Authority reaches, Mr. *Rhina's* Argument is utterly lost: And the *First* Form of Government certainly *might* be altered; because, by the preceeding Scheme, it actually *was* altered. I am then longing after this Representation to hear what Judgment Mr. *Rhind* will pass upon his above Reasonings.

I should now proceed to the next Particular, but I crave leave ere I go further to make an Observe or two.

In the First Place I observe that there is nothing the *Episcopal* Authors, and Mr. *Rhind* as much as any, more frequently and willingly slide into than Harangues against a Government by *Parity*. Here they lay out all their Colours, exert their utmost Eloquence, and even bear down their Reader with a Torrent of Rhetorick. But I hope by this Time the Reader is abundantly convinced that these same Harangues against *Parity* are very senseless Things. For, *First*, by the former Account from M. *Doawell* we have heard that *Presbyters* had not the least Share in the Government, and that the WHOLE Government was in the Bishop's Hands, and in his ALONE. *Secondly*, the same M. *Dodwell* assures us, and he is certainly right in it, that all Bishops were originally equal. By Divine Right are so, and continued to be so till towards the Reign of *Constantine* the Great that *Archbishops* and *Metropolitans* were brought in, not upon any Divine Warrant, but by Factions among themselves (*k*). *Thirdly*, he assures us in like Manner, that the Church in each Nation and Province was governed by the Episcopal College (*l*), and that too acting in a *Parity*. *Fourthly*, 'That the said *Parity* of all Bishops (*m*) was most consistent even with a flourishing Discipline both of *Faith* and *Manners*, and that the very *Parity* it self would

[k] *Paranef. Sect. 42* p. 124. Sequitur ergo, quæcunque deinceps obtineant Imparitas, eam omnia legulorum episcoporum potius esse tribuendum, tam unæque valere quantum illa valent pascia. Quamdiu obtineant *Paritas* statuerè difficile est, tot primævis monumentis dependens. Suspicio autem occurrunt et temporaria *Constantini*. (l) *One Presbiter*, Preface. Sect. 8. (m) *Paranef. Sect. 39*. Sic ubi obstat quo minus, in Principia Episcoporum omnium *Paritas*, vigeat tamen Disciplina tam Fidei, quam Morum, convenientissima *Paritas* certe ipsa inter illas omnes ablatum erat, quæ e Typholeulari, exemplationis, vel ex invidia sepe oritur.

‘ would take away all these Contentions which often arise from
 ‘ Worldly Pride, Emulation or Envy. Is it not then plain that the
 Government of the Church Universal, and the Government of every
 National Church was and ought to be by *Parity*? And what then
 signifie all their Declamations against *Parity*? Will they not equally
 serve the *Presbyterians* against an *Episcopal Parity*, as they do the *Epis-*
copalians against a *Presbyterian Parity*? Or is *Parity* so Nimble a thing
 as to alier its Nature according as the Side is that espouses it? I
 would then advise our Episcopal Brethren to reserve their Harangues
 on that Subject till they hear of a new Edition of the *Formula Ora-*
torie; for though they import nothing in the Controversie of
 Church Government, yet they may be worth their Room *there*;
 and possibly be usefull to some School Boy of a Barren Fancy to fur-
 nish out his *Oratton* with.

In the *Second Place*, What a very Jest do the greatest Authors on
 the Episcopal Side make themselves. Dr. *Hammond* in innumer-
 able Places (*n*) will have us believe that the Apostles at first or-
 dained no *Meer Presbyters* but *Bishops* only. No, saith Mr. *Dod-*
well, the Apostles at first ordain’d no *Bishops* but *simple Presbyters*
 only. Here are the two greatest Champions of the Cause by the
 Ears together on the most Material Point of the Controversie. What
 can the *Presbyterians* do in the mean while but gather the Spoil,
 which, I think, very plainly falls to their Share which soever of
 ’em two gains the Victory. For if Dr. *Hammond* be right, the *Pres-*
byterians cannot be Wrong; a *Bishop* without *Presbyters* under Him
 being the likest Thing in the World to a *Presbyterian Minister*.
 But if Mr. *Dodwell* is right, the *Presbyterians* clearly gain the Cause;
 there being no Mention of *Episcopal Government* in the New Testa-
 ment; and the Year of Christ CVI being the *first* year of its Settle-
 ment. For my own Part I am perfectly convinced that the Apostles
 ordain’d no *Presbyters* but such as were *Bishops* too in the full Scrip-
 ture extent of that Word, that is, who had Power of *Ordaining*,
exercising Discipline and *Governing* the Church as well as of *Preach-*
ing and dispensing the *Sacraments*. But that these *Bishops* had (as
 Dr. *Hammond* fancies) a Power of *Ordaining* under themselves *Sim-*

ple *Presbyters* as they call them, that is, Men impowered to *Preach* and Dispense the *Sacraments*, which is the worthier Part of the Office, and on the Account of which especially the *double-Honour* is due; without Power of *Ordaining* and *Governing*, which is the lesser Part of the Office, I shall believe it when I see it proved. In the mean Time I am not more perswaded that there is such a Book as the Bible, than I am that there is no mention in it of any such Creature as a *Simple Presbyter* or of a Power lodged in the Hands of a *Bishop* to make any such; or that there is in all the Kingdom a *Presbyterian* Minister who is not as much a *Bishop*, in all that Sense the New Testament means the Word, as the Primate of all *England* is. I now proceed to Examine.

IV. His Demonstration for the *Divine* Right of *Prelacy* from its being confirmed by *Miracles*. The Reader heard before of Mr. *Rhina's* Miracle-Working Bishops. This He tells us p. 69. *has given him the Hint of a Thing which in His Opinion is a Plain Demonstration for Episcopacy*; which is this in His own Words.

‘ Seeing after that Time, in which a Proper Episcopacy is acknowledged to have universally obtain’d, severals (whom the Adversaries of that venerable Order cannot deny to have been Bishops in the Ordinary acceptation of that Term) were allowed the Gifts of the Holy Ghost; ’tis certain that Their Office was of Divine Institution For it is not to be supposed that our Lord wou’d have vouchsafed them these special Donatives of Heaven, which they employed in the Discharge of the Episcopcal Office, had it been (what the Presbyterians commonly call it) an Antichristian Usurpation. Thus, if the Office of an Apostle be of Divine Institution, that of a Bishop must be so too, the Credentials for the Mission of Both being of the same Authority. This is His Demonstration.

I do not wonder to find M. *Dodwell* (o) hint at this Argument, his Scheme had need of it: For he ingenuously owns that *Episcopacy* is not to be found in the New Testament; nor indeed can be, as be-
ing

[o] Paranes. Sect. 17. p. 74. Erant præterea, illo quoque Seculo Donæ Spiritus S. & Miracula illustria, quæ Deum sub illa quoque Disciplina præsentissimum probant. Quæ sane sperari non poterant, si ab Antichristo & Aniquitatis Myſterio mutatio tanta processisset, quod volumi Nuperi Magistri.

ing later than all the Writings thereof. But for Mr. Rhind who was so well furnished with Arguments from the Scripture, to oppress us with these and with *Miracles* too was very unmercifull. However seeing he will needs go upon the Topick of *Miracles* and *extraordinary Gifts*, I think it but reasonable that *Presbytry* should put in for its Share. Bishop *Spotswood* himself relates (p) of *John Knox*, that he prophesied of *Thomas Maitland* a younger Brother of *Lethington's*, who had insulted upon the Murder of the good Regent *Murray*, That he should die where none should be to lament him. And the Prophecie was literally accomplished. He relates also (q) that he foretold of the Earl of *Morton* That his End should be with Shame and Ignominy if he did not mend his Manners; which the Earl remembered at the Time of his Execution, and said ' that he found these Words to be true and ' *John Knox* therein to be a Prophet. He relates also (r) how he prophesied that the Laird of *Grange* should be pulled out of his Nest, and his Carcase hang before the Sun, which accordingly came to pass. He relates also (s) a Couple of Miraculous Providences interposed in behalf of M. *John Craig* another *Presbyterian* Minister. Twenty other Things, as miraculous and at least as well attested as these of *Melito*, *Veneus*, or *Gregory* might be related of other *Presbyterian* Ministers; but for the greater Credit, I have satisfied my self with these recorded by the *Episcopal* Historian.

In the mean Time I am fully convinced that there cannot be a greater Weakness than to bring such Things in Argument on the one Side or the other. Had ever a *Bishop* or any Body else come and preached to the World that *Episcopacy* is of Divine Right, and that all the Passages of the New Testament relating to Church Government are to be understood in a Sense consistent with that Doctrine, and had offered to work a Miracle for Confirmation of all this. Had the Event Answered, and an uncontested Miracle been wrought; I acknowledge it might have superseded all other Arguments, and put an End to all further Disputes. But I suppose it will puzzle Mr. *Rhind* to find where this was ever done; nay which is a great unhappiness to him, by his Account such a Miracle

[p] Church Hist. p. 234. [q] Ibid. p. 264. [r] Ibid. p. 266. [s] Ibid. p. 462.

Miracle in those early Days had been unnecessary; because no Body then was in any Doubt about the *Divine* Right of *Prelacy*: No *Calvin* was not born for many hundreds of Years after; nay, *Aerius* himself that Father of *Presbyterian* Schismatics was yet sleeping in his Original Causes. There are several good Protestants that do not think that all the Miracles reported to be wrought by the *Jesuits* in their Missions among the Pagans are meer Forgeries. If there was any Thing real in Them, it was a Seal to the Truth of Christianity in General which was the great avowed End of their Mission. But will any Body infer thence that the Order of the *Jesuits* is of Divine Institution? *Balaam* was endued with Extraordinary Gifts, does it therefore follow that God approved of his Character as a *Diviner* or *Soothsayer*? *Cyprian*, discoursing of some who had broken off the Church by Schism, yet supposes it possible for Them to signalize themselves by Miracles (*t*). In like Manner *Augustin*. ‘Let no Man, saith he (*v*), vend Fables among you. Both *Pontius* wrought a Miracle, and *Donatus* prayed and God answered him from Heaven. First either They are deceived themselves, or else They deceive others. However suppose he could remove Mountains, yet, saith the Apostle, *If I have not Charity I am nothing*. Let us see whether he hath not Charity, I should have believed it, if he had not divided the Unity: For my God hath warned me against all such Wonder-mongers saying *In the latter Days there shall arise false Prophets doing Signs and Wonders*. Thus *Augustin*. Here then is one *Demonstration* for *Episcopacy* fairly spoiled. But as it is not the First, so it is not likely to be the Last.

ART.

[*t*] *Cyprian* de Unitat. Ecclesie. Nam & prophetare, & Demona excludere, & Virtutes magnas in terra facere, &c. omnis utique & admirabilis res est; non tamen Regnum coeleste consequitur quisquis in his omnibus invenitur, nisi rectè & iusti Interis observatione [*h. e.* *Unitatis Ecclesie*] gradiatur. [*v*] *Augustinus* Tom. IX. Tract. 13. in Evan. Joan. p. 122. Nemo ergo vobis fabulas vendat. Et Pontius fecit miraculum, & Donatus oravit & respondit ei Deus de Calb. Primo aut falluntur aut fallunt. Postremo facillum montes transire. Charitatem autem, inquit, non habeam, nihil sum. Videamus utrum habuerit Charitatem. Credi rem, si non displicet Unitatem. Nam & contra istos, ut sic loquar, mirabiliores cautum me fecit Deus meus. Dicemus; In novissimis temporibus exurgent Pseudoprophetae, facientes signa & portenta.

ARTICLE III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for the Institution of Prelacy from the Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus, is Examined. From P. 74 to P. 84.

UPON this Argument I shall I. Examine His Reasonings by which He introduces Himself to it. II. The Argument it self, and what He has advanced for making it a Good one.

I. I am to Examine His Reasonings by which He introduces Himself to the Argument. I have so good an Opinion of His Judgment as to believe He Himself was convinced of the Weakness of what He has hitherto advanced. But, saith He p. 74, *there is yet still something behind which ALONE does SUFFICIENTLY prove, that that Superiority of Power which the Apostles exercised over the Subordinate Orders of Clergy Men, that is, over Priests and Deacons (and why not over Prelats too, seeing there were then such? Wou'd He have us to believe They were hail Fellow with the Apostles?) was not peculiar to Them, and consequently not EXTRAORDINARY.* Now pray what may this be? 'Tis this, 'That the same was communicated to others, even to so many, that perhaps there was not a Church constituted by the Apostles, where there was not such a Superior Officer appointed: at least this holds True of the greatest Number of these whereof there is Mention made in the New Testament. It will be very strange if Mr. Rhind can make good this: For First, There is the Church of Corinth, the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Philippi and all Macedonia, the Church of Thessalonica, with a great many more mentioned in the New Testament; but of any such Superior Officer in any of 'em there is a deep Silence in the Scripture. Secondly, 'Tis the very reverse of Mr. Doanell's Doctrine; accord-

according to whom, as we have already heard, there was no such Superior ORDINARY Officer appointed in any Church constituted by the Apostles, the WHOLE Government being managed by EXTRAORDINARY Officers sent from Jerusalem. But Mr. Rhind challenges the Presbyterians to condescend from the Acts and Epistles, upon one Act of Ordination and Jurisdiction, about which such an Officer was not principally employed. And I challenge Him again, indeed all His Party, to condescend upon one Act about which such an Officer, not EXTRAORDINARY, was employed. Mr. Rhind foresaw that His Challenge would be thus returned. And this brings Me

II. To Examine His *Argument* or *Instance* in Answer to the said returned Challenge. *This*, saith He p. 74, *was the Case of Ephesus and Crete, where Timothy and Titus acted with such a Superiority of Power.* I Answer, not Good: For *Timothy and Titus* were *Extraordinary Officers*, and therefore it cannot be thence inferred That that Superiority of Power was design'd to be perpetual. Mr. Rhind was aware that this *Answer* would be made to Him; and therefore having, with unusual Ceremony and Good-breeding, declared p. 76, *that it is not so contemptible as some would represent it*, He applies Himself with all His might to defend against it; and to prove that *Timothy and Titus* were not *Extraordinary Officers*, but the *Ordinary and fixed Prelats of Ephesus and Crete.*

This He argues *First*, from the Silence of the Scripture, that there is no Intimation made in all the Acts and Epistles that They were such Extraordinary Officers. *Secondly*, From the Postscripts to their Epistles which expressly call them the *first Bishops*, that is, *Ordinary and fixed Prelates of Ephesus and Crete.* *Thirdly*, From the concurring Testimony of the Ancients, who with one Voice declare as the Postscripts do. *Fourthly*, From Scripture Authorities proving that *Timothy and Titus* were of an Order Superior to Presbyters and Deacons, and such as was always to be continued in the Church. A Set of very strong Arguments I acknowledge. Let us Examine whether he has made them good.

First, He asserts *that there is no Intimation made in all the Acts and Epistles that Timothy and Titus were such Extraordinary Officers*, p. 77. I affirm the contrary. No, Mr. Dodwell, I should have said,

said, affirms the contrary; and Proves, from the very same Arguments drawn out of the Epistles which the *Presbyterians* have always insisted on, that their Office was not fixed with respect to *Ephesus* and *Crete*, but that They were Itinerant Missionaries. This he proves with Respect to *Timothy* from S. Paul's BESEECHING him to abide at *Ephesus*, from his being called an *Evangelist*, from his frequent Journeys with S. Paul, and the like. And with Respect to *Titus*, he affirms that he was not more confined to any one place than the Apostle Paul himself was. I have set down his Words on the Margin (x) that the Reader may see all this.

Secondly, he argues from the *Postscripts* to the *Epistles* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, which, saith he p. 78. do expressly call them the first Bishops, that is, Ordinary and fixed Prelates, of *Ephesus* and *Crete*. Well, is it true that they were so? We have already heard M. Dodwell; let us hear another, who was as much concerned to keep the Episcopal Cause Right as ever Mr. Rhind is likely to be. The Person I mean is Dr. Whitby. 'First, saith he (y), I assert, that if by saying *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops, the one of *Ephesus* the other of *Crete*, we understand that they took upon them these Churches or Diocesses as their FIXED and PECULIAR Charge, in which they were to preside for Term of Life, I believe that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not thus Bishops. Thus he. But what now shall become of the Credit of the poor *Postscripts* by this? Why the same Dr. Whitby proves them to be false from the very letter of the Text it self in the *Epistles*. But Mr. Rhind is more tender hearted. 'Though, saith he, They are no Part of the Canon of the Scriptures; yet are they of so much Authority, that the *Presbyterians* themselves have not yet dared to cancel them in the Common Bibles. Very pleasantly! But then let me ask, in the First Place, seeing They are no Part of the Canon, what Authority can they have beyond what the Reputation of

O

[x] Parænes. Sect. 10. p. 40. 41. Sed vero munus illius (*Timothei*) non FIXUM fuisse sed Itinerarium multa arguunt. Rogatum illum mansisse *Ephesi* testatur Apostolus, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. Erat ergo, cum rogaretur, Itinerarius. Arguit opus *Evangelista* 2 *Tim.* 4. 5, Arguunt tot illius cum S. Paulo itinera, & con mune illius cum Apostolo Nomen in Inscriptionibus Epistolarum ad *Thesalonicenses*. Similiter *Tito*, & quidem soli de constitutendis in *Crete* & *77* & *78* Presbyteris, idem præcipit Apostolus, *Tit.* 1. 5. Relictum illum fuisse ait, ut ea quæ deerant, corrigeret. Comitum utique Apostoli cum relinqueretur Et sane Comitum S. Pauli alia quoque loca docuit, non magis utique certo alicui loco adstrictum quam ipse fuerit Apostolus. [y] Prelate to the Epistle to *Titus*.

of the Authors of them can give them? Now who were the Authors of them? I doubt if that can be discovered unless one would go to *Endor*. Were they at least early? No, I will yield the Argument to Mr. *Rhind* if he can find them for at least 500 Years after the Epistles were written; nay, saies Dr. *Hammond* (z). *We know that the Subscriptions of the Epistles are not to be found in all the Ancient Copies.* 2dly, 'Tis true the *Presbyterians* have not dar'd to cancell them in the Common Bibles. But then I would ask him Who first put them into the Common Bibles? I doubt very much if they came there by fair Play. The Oldest *English* Translations have them not. I have by me *Rychard Taverners* Translation Printed in the yere of oure Lozde God M. D. XXXIX. wherein there is not one Syllable of the Bishopricks of *Timothy* and *Titus*. For Instance, the *Postscript* to the Second Epistle to *Timothy*, bears this only; *Written from Rome when Paule was presented the second Tyme up before Empeyours Nero.* But not one Word of *Timothy's* being ordained either *First* or *Second* Bishop. I ask Mr. *Rhind*, Secondly, who caused print these *Postscripts* in the same Letter with the Text, whereas usually they were put in a different Letter that they might be known to be no Part of the Canon? Good Mr. *Rhind*, pray purge your Parry. In the mean Time it is not very generous to take Advantage of the *Presbyterians* for their not cancelling them, when they dar'd not do it; the Power of printing Bibles being the Prince's Gift nor the Church's. However from the whole 'tis plain, that it is Ridiculous to make an Argument of these *Postscripts*.

Thirdly, He argues from the concurring Testimonies of the Ancients who with one Voice declare as the *Postscripts* do. And to this, saith he p. 78, the *Presbyterians* will find themselves straitned to rejoin. No Doubt. Well, where are these Testimonies of the Ancients? Oh, how easie were it for Him to add to the Number of Pages by Quotations to this Purpose? But still I ask where are they? Nay not one of these Ancients has he quoted to this Purpose. Nay, nor so much as Named. Who now can doubt but the *Presbyterians* must find themselves straitned to rejoin? But if an *Episcopalian* rejoin, will

will it not do as well? Hear then Dr. *Whitby*. ‘The great Controversie, saith He (a), concerning this and the Epistle to *Timothy*, is, whether *Timothy* and *Titus* were indeed made Bishops, the one of *Ephesus* and the *Proconsular Asia*, the other of *Crete*, having Authority to make, and Jurisdiction over so many Bishops as were in those Precincts. Now of this Matter, I confess I can find Nothing in any Writer of the first three Centuries, nor any Intimation that they bore that Name. Thus he. And the *Presbyterians* being secured from the *Ancients* of the first three Centuries, any Hazard from the rest is not much to be regarded: For, as *M. Le Clerc* most Judiciously observes (b) ‘The Testimonies of the Antients about this Matter, who Judged rashly of the Times of the Apostles by their own, and spake of them in the Language of their own Age, are of little Moment; and so do no more prove that *Titus* was Bishop of the Island of *Crete*, than what Dr. *Hammond* saies, proves Him to have been dignified with the Title of an Archbishop.

Fourthly, He argues from Scripture Authorities which prove, as he saies p. 79, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were of an Order Superior to *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and such as was always to be continued in the Church.

First. With respect to *Timothy* he observes from *Acts* 20. 31. compared with *Acts* 19. 10. and *Acts* 19. 26. and *Acts* 20. 17. that *Ephesus* was furnished with Pastors ere the Apostle *Paul* left them. And yet he besought *Timothy* to abide there to charge some that They should teach no other Doctrine, and to perform several other Functions which import a Superiority of Power, with respect to Ordination and Jurisdiction: ‘For, saith He p. 81, Is it to be supposed, if the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* of *Ephesus* could alone have discharged these Offices, that St. *Paul* wou’d have continued *Timothy* there, encroaching on their Divine Right. The Answer is abundantly obvious; for First, when the Apostle was a departing out of these Bounds, he warned the Elders of *Ephesus* that after His Departure Grievous Wolves should enter in not sparing the Flock. To give a

O 2

Check

[a] Ibid ubi Supra p. 485. Vol. II. [b] Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Annot. on the Ep. to *Titus* p. (mibi) 530.

Check to such it was Expedient in the Infancy of that Church; (none of Her Ministers being then above three Years Standing in the Office *Acts* 20. 31.) that a Person both of Extraordinary Character and Gifts should be among them. Which, when once the Government was settled and Things brought into a fixed Order, there would be no such Occasion for. Secondly, *Paul's* beseeching *Timothy* to abide at *Ephesus* is a certain Argument; as we have heard from Mr. *Dodwell*, That he was not there established Bishop: For to what End should He beseech a Bishop to reside in his own Diocese, when he could not do otherwise without offending God and neglecting his Duty. Thirdly, The Elders of *Ephesus* already ordained were Bishops. So, saies Dr. *Hammond*, nay so saies the Sacred Text *Acts* 20. 28. *over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops:* And therefore as Bishops They had Power to perform all Ministerial Functions, and only wanted such an Extraordinary Person as *Timothy* to direct and assist them in their present Circumstances. The *Romans*, sometimes when the Common Wealth was in Imminent Danger, created a Dictator with an Absolute Power for Six Months, without bounding him with any other Instructions but that he should take care *Ne quid Detrimenti Republicæ caperet*. But will it therefore follow that the Dictatorship was a standing Office? Or will the *Roman's* making Choise of such an Officer in their Extremity justifie or excuse *Sylla* or *Julius Caesar* who would needs have themselves declared *Perpetual Dictators*, and thereby enslaved their Native Country. Though one takes Physick when he is sick, yet it would be a very unpleasant Diet for Ordinary. Though a Gentleman wears leading Strings while he is a Child; and is under Tutors or Curators till he is one and Twenty, does it follow that he must always be so?

Secondly, With respect to *Titus*. Mr. *Rhind* suggests that he was left at *Crete* with a Power to inspect the Qualifications of such as should be ordained *Chap.* 1. 7. to rebuke bidders as well as others *Chap.* 2. 15. to reject, that is to Excommunicate, *Hereticks*, and all this notwithstanding there were other Church Officers ordained there before: For He was left to set in Order the Things (relating to Ordination and Jurisdiction) which were wanting which must needs infer that he acted in a Capacity Superior to them. 'Tis answered,

ed,

ed. *Crete* was as yet in a great Measure unplanted when *Paul* left him there. He was left there on Purpose to Ordain Elders in every City. These Elders whom he ordain'd were *Bishops*; the Text expressly saies it *Chap. i. 5---7.* *Dr. Hammond* Himself owns it. When therefore they were once ordain'd, they had Power to perform all Acts any Bishop is capable of. But *Mr. Rhind* asserts p. 83, 'That *Titus*, after he had ordained Elders in every one of the Cities of *Crete*, continued there exercising what we properly call an Episcopal Jurisdiction over them when ordained. But, *First*, not one Word has he offered for the Proof of this. *Secondly*, The Scripture contradicts it as we shall hear just now. *Thirdly*, If he exercised any Jurisdiction over them, they being Bishops themselves, it could not be simply an *Episcopal* but strictly and properly an *Archiepiscopal* Jurisdiction. But 'tis plain he did not continue in *Crete* to exercise either: For, *Fourthly*, *Dr. Whately* not only confesses, but proves from Scripture that he did not continue there. 'As for *Titus* he was only left at *Crete* to Ordain Elders in every City and to set in Order the Things that were wanting. Having therefore done that Work, he had done all that was assigned him in that Station. And therefore *S. Paul* sends for him the very next Year to *Nicopolis Tit. 3. 12.* Thus He. If therefore *Mr. Rhind's* Instance prove any Thing, it must be the Divine Right of *Non-residence*, which indeed wou'd be no ungratefull Performance to several People in the World

Thus I have gone through whatever *Mr. Rhind* has advanced on this Proof. And now to Conclude it; there is Nothing Surer than that there was a perfect Equality among *Bishops* for the first three Centuries, and so *M. Dodwell* affirms. There is Nothing plainer from the Scripture than that there were Bishops at *Ephesus* before *Timothy* was left there; and that those whom *Titus* ordained in *Crete* were *Bishops* in all that Sence of the Word the New Testament owns. How then *Timothy* and *Titus* could be the fixed and ordinary Prelats of *Ephesus* and *Crete* is beyond the Power of Natural Understanding to conceive. If *Mr. Rhind* can solve me in this one Scruple, or if any other of his Brethren can, I shall own it as a singular Obligation. And therefore I desire them to take pains on their Answer, and to Labour it with all due Care.

ARTICLE IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for Prelacy from the Apocalyptick Angels, is Examined.

From P. 84. to P. 86.

MR. Rhind is much shorter on this than on any of the Preceding Proofs. The Reason, no doubt, is, because 'tis much clearer. And therefore He puts on all his Airs, and treats the *Presbyterians* with a Noble Disdain in the Confidence of it; wondring They can be so *Senseless* or Obstinate as to resist its Evidence. That I may not wrong Him, I shall set down every Word of what he has on it without the least Omission.

And that such a Superior Order did obtain a considerable Time after this, is evident from the Instances of the *Seven Apocalyptick Angels*, to whom our Lord directs so many Epistles by his Servant St. John: A plain Indication of his Approbation of that Authority which they exercised; especially considering that there is no Insinuation made to its Disadvantage in the Epistles directed to them. And that these Angels were *single* Persons, and the *Governors* of these Churches, will be evident to any who shall impartially consider the 2d and 3d Chap. of the *Revelation*, where they are plainly characterized as such, so very plainly, that perhaps all the Authors who ever commented upon them, whether *Ancient* or *Modern*, have supposed them to be such. Nor was it ever questioned by any, till the Interest of a Party obliged some to search for Criticisms, by which they might seem with their Followers to answer the Argument drawn from these Instances for *Episcopacy*: But the Evasions they have been forced to use, are so *senseless*, and have been so often exposed as such, that I am saved the Labour of exposing them further, or of repeating what has

‘ has been already said to disprove them; only I must add, that
 ‘ so groundless are they, and such is the Evidence of Truth on the
 ‘ *Episcopal* Side, that it extorted from some *Presbyterian* Authors and
 ‘ particularly from *Beza*, one of the most Zealous and Learned Pa-
 ‘ trons of Parity, a Confession that these Angels were *single Per-*
 ‘ sons, and the *Governors* of these seven *Asian Churches*.

Now let us examine all this.

In the First Place: Were these *Apocalyptick* Angels the *fixed* Bishops of these Churches? 'Tis true Mr. *Dodwell*, in his Book of the *One Priesthood and one Altar* which he published in the Year 1683, is of the Opinion (c) that the Bishops are here represented in a *Mystical Way*, and personated by the Name of Angels; but in his *Parænesis*, a Book which he published above 20 Years after the former, and which consequently must be supposed to be the Wiser Book of the two, he frequently inculcates, as we have heard before, that there were no *fixed* Bishops in the World at that Time; and particularly as to these *Apocalyptick* Angels, though he is in a very great Doubt what to make of them (d), yet by no means will he allow them either to have been *Bishops* or indeed the *fixed Presbyteries* of the Place; but guesses them to have been *Itinerary Legates* sent from *Jerusalem* answering to the *seven Spirits* *Zach. 4. 10. that are the Eyes of the Lord which run to and fro through the whole Earth.* (e) Was Mr. *Rhind* then to seek for Confidence when he would be so positive in a Matter of which the greatest Man of his Party cou'd not have a clear View; and in which, so far as he could guess, he has determined against Him.

Secondly, How came Mr. *Rhind* to number these *Apocalyptick* Angels, calling them the *SEVEN* *Apocalyptick* Angels? The *Apocalypse* it self does not call them *SEVEN*. It is said indeed *Chap. 1. 20. that the seven Candlesticks are the seven Churches*, there both the Symbols and Things represented by them are

[c] Chap. XII. Sect. 2. p. 332. &c. [d] Vide Sect. 10. p. 32.

[e] *Parænes.* Sect. 10. p. 32. Ita tuisse necesse erat, si quidem vere Episcopi fuissent Angeli Apocalyptici. Sed de illis sententiam nostram non explicabimus. p. 39. 40. Si non suffecerint, ut alios tuisse verisimilimum esset Angelos Ecclesiarum, vel legatos ab antituris locorum Presbyteris. Erant ergo etiam ipsi tunc illi Hierosolymitanorum Legati, sed Apostolici ipsi obnoxii. - ut prout *Oculus Domini septem Spiritibus* respondet. ut *Angeli Apoc.* qui discurrant per universam Terram. Sic fuerunt etiam hi Ecclesiarum Prædicti non loco orandi, sed missi Hierosolymis Itinerantes.

are numbered : But it is not so in the other Branch. 'Tis not said *The Seven Stars are the Seven Angels, but indefinitely are the Seven Angels of the seven Churches.* Is not this a plain Indication that the Holy Ghost would not oblige us to take the Word *Angels* singularly?

Thirdly, are these Angels *characterized* as single Persons? Though Mr. Rhind indeed is more than ordinarily Sharp sighted, yet I am so far from seeing this *Evident*, that I cannot discern one Shadow of it; but on the contrary, I think I see them, and that too as *plainly* as ever I saw any Thing, *characterized* so as to denote a Collective Body. Possibly my Sight is vitiated; but then much greater Men I'm sure than I, and at least as good Friends to the *Episcopal* Cause, have seen them just the same Way. Dr. Henry More, a Man of an Apocalyptic Genius himself, frankly owns (f) 'That by *Angels*, according to the Apocalyptic Stile, all the Agents under their Pre-
'sidency are represented or insinuate. And this, *saith he*, is so frequent and obvious in the *Apocalypse*, that none that is versed therein can any wise doubt of it. Wherefore Christ his Writing to the
'Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* in this Mystical Sense is his Writing to all Bishops, Pastors and Christians in the first Apostolical Interval of the Church. Thus Dr. More. Yea Mr. Dodwell himself owns (g) That the whole Churches of the *Lydian* or *Proconsular Asia* are to be understood by the Mystical Representation in the *Apocalypse*, and that the Reason why S. John confined his Number to *Seven* is, 'not that by any Geographical Distinction those Seven Cities
'were incorporated into a Body more than others of that Province,
'but that he had a particular Regard to the Number of the Angels
'of the Presence. How is all this consistent with their being *characterized* as single Persons? But let us wave Human Judgment and appeal to the Text.

Fourthly, I ask, Are these Angels *characterized* in the 2d and 3d Chap. of the *Revelation* as single Persons and the *Governors* of these Churches? 'Tis true each Epistle is directed *to the Angel* in the singular Number. But 'tis as true, that that Title agrees to every Minister of the Gospel, and to every one that bears the Message of

of the Lord. And it is as true, that the Word *Angel* even in the singular Number bears a Collective Sense; as when it is said Psalm 34. 7. *The Angel of the Lord encamps round about them that fear him.* So that nothing can be inferred on the Episcopal Side either from the Title it self, or from the Usage of it in the singular Number. But then if we look into the Body of the Epistles themselves, consider the Way how they are ushered in, and the solemn Clause with which each of them concludes, 'tis plain that *Angel* must be taken in a Collective Sense, as including not only all the Ministers of the Church but indeed the whole Church it self. Thus, in the first Place John directs his Revelations to the Seven Churches which are in Asia. Rev. 1. 4. Thus the Voice behind him ordered him, *What thou seest write in a Book, and send it unto the seven Churches which are in Asia* Rev. 1. v. 10. 11. Thus at the End of the whole Vision, *I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these Things in the Churches* Rev. 22. 16. Thus at the End of every of the Epistles there is that Solemn Clause, *he that hath an Ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.* Secondly, if we look into the Bodies of the Epistles themselves, we shall find the Thing still more clear. First in the Epistle to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus shall we think that the Commendation for Labour and Patience, the Reproof of the Decay of the first Love, the Exhortation to Repentance, the Threatning to remove the Candlestick out of his Place, were directed to or concern'd only one single Person? Would our Saviour punish a whole Church so grievously as to deprive them of the Gospel for the Fault of their Bishop? No. When he saies the Angel of Ephesus, He means the Church in it saith Aretas Bishop of Casarea in Cappadocia (b). 2ly, When he bids the Angel of the Church of Smyrna. *Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer: Is it not presently added, Behold the Devil shall cast SOME of YOU into Prison that YE may be tryed; and YE shall have Tribulation ten Days.* Is this the Characterizing of a single Person? When he exhorts to Faithfulness, and makes Promise to him that overcomes, does he direct to the Bishop only? No, saith Augustin (i) He saies it to the whole Church. 3dly, When he saith to the Angel of the Church of Pergamus, *I know thy Works, and where thou*

dwellest,

[h] Comment. in Apoc. *ἄνγλος ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία ἄγγελος.*

[i] Augustin Tom. IX. Homil. 2. in Apoc. *Omni Ecclesia dicitur.*

dwellest, even where Satan's Seat is, was it the Bishop only had such bad Quarters, when 'tis instantly added in the end of the Verse, *Antipas my faithfull Martyr was slain among YOU where Satan dwelleth?* No, saith *Augustin* (k), ' these things under a singular Word are said ' to the whole Church, because *Satan* dwells every where by His ' Body: Now the Body of *Satan* are Proud and wicked Men, ' just as the Body of *Christ* are such as are humble and Good. Indeed the whole Church in these Parts was in the greatest Danger of Idolatry, or of Persecution in Case of not complying with it: For in *Pergamus* stood the famous Temple of *Aesculapius*, whither the greatest Personages went, or sent their Gifts because of the Fame of his Oracle. Thither *Earinus Domitian's* freed Man sent his consecrated Hair with a Mirrour and a Box set with Jewels (l). Thither the Emperour *Antonius Caracalla* went to be cured of his Sickness by the God, and to ly in for Dreams (m). Thither also *Apollonius Tyanæus*, who was set up to mate our Saviour, went to be Director of the Oracle, and to instruct the Votaries that came there how They might obtain Divine Dreams from the God (n). To this God Dragons and Serpents were Sacred, and maintained on the Publick Charge in His Temple. Fittly therefore was *Satan* that *Dragon* and *old Serpent* Rev. 12. 9. said to have *His Seat* there. Add to all this, that admitting there had been such Officers as *Prelates* in those Days, yet it would be probable that the *See* was Vacant at this Time: For, as the Tradition goes, *Antipas* was the Bishop of that Place; but *He* was Martyred in the Tenth Year of *Domitian*, as the *Roman Martyrology* bears; which was the very Year in which, as the most common Tradition carries it, *John the Divine* was banished to *Patmos*. And *Dr. Hammond*, foreseeing, it seems, this Difficulty, placed *John's* Banishment in the Reign of *Claudius*. And makes the Relation of the Martyrdom of *Antipas* Rev. 2. 13. to be not *History* but *Prophecie*; and
whereas

[k] *Ubi supra* -- omni Ecclesie dicit in unitis vocabulo, quia ubique habitat Satanæ per Corpus suum: Corpus autem Satanæ homines sunt superbi & mali: Sicut & corpus Christi humiles & boni.

[l] ----- Dulcesque Capillos

Pergameo posuit dona sacra Deo. Mart.

[m] *Herodian* Lib. 4. Cap. 5. 11.

[n] *Pbilostr.* in vit. *Apoll.* Lib. 4. Cap. III.

whereas the Text reads, *Antipas my Faithfull Martyr was slain*, He paraphrases it, *Antipas, for His Fidelity and Courage in preaching the Gospel, will be (I foresee) cruelly Martyr'd*. And if the See was Vacant at that Time, how could the Epistle be directed to the Bishop? 4thly, When He writes to the Angel of the Church in *Thyatira*, was it the Works, Charity, Service, Faith and Patience of the Bishop alone that He commends *verse 19*? Was it the Bishop alone whom He reproved for *suffering that Woman Jezabel*? No, saith, *Augustin (o)*. 'It was such (*in the Plural Number*) as were set over the Church, who neglected to impose that severe Discipline upon Fornicators and other riotous Livers which They ought. Is the Angel of that Church characterized as a single Person, when 'tis expressly said *verse 24*. But unto YOU I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira. Are not here two Parts of the Church plainly distinguished, viz. the Ministers thereof in the plural Word YOU, and the people described by *the rest in Thyatira*? The only Answer which the Episcopal Party have for avoiding the Force of this Observe is, That the Word *and* is not to be found in some Copies; and so they read the Text thus, *Unto you I say the rest in Thyatira*. But all Answers are to be suspected that invade the Text. 'Tis true, the Word *and* is wanting in some Copies; but it is as true it is to be found in many more, and these too of as good Credit and as great Antiquity. In the Year 1546. *Tonstall* Bishop of *Durham* found an *Exposition on the Apocalypse* bearing the Name of *St. Ambrose* the Bishop (*p*), which He published in the Year 1554, and in His preface to the Reader He is earnest to have him believe that it is the Work of *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan*, and He expressly reads it with the *And*. I believe indeed *Tonstall* was deceived about the Author. But this is certain that whoever He was, He was a very Ancient Writer, and accordingly

P 2

ly

[o] Quod autem dicit Angelo Thyatiræ Ecclesiæ [*Habeo adversum te paucos*] dicit Præpositis Ecclesiarum: qui Luxuriosis & fornicantibus, & aliud quod libet malum agentibus ferociteram Disciplinæ Ecclesiasticæ non imponunt. *Hom. 2. in Apoc.*

(p) *Expositio Beati Ambrosii Episcopi super Apocalypsin.*

ly the Work is inserted among those of St. *Ambrose* (q). And though that Writer sometimes mentions the *Bishop* in His Exposition of these seven Epistles, yet he not only interprets the *Stars* by *Holy Preachers* in the general, but also lays down (r) this as a general Rule, That *all* the Governours of the *Catholick Church* are signified by these Angels, and that because of their being Messengers of the Word of God, to the People, seeing the Word *Angel* signifies a *Messenger*. And though *Beza* upon the Authority of the *old interpreter* and of the *Complutensian* Edition and two other Copies did read the said 24. *verse* without the *AND*, yet in other Editions (s) He has inserted it, and always expounds the Phrase *To the Angel*, by these words *To the Pastors*. 5thly, When he gives this Character of the Angel of the Church of *Sardis*, *Thou hast a Name that thou livest, and art Dead*, Is it a Description of one single Person in that Church, whether Bishop or Presbyter? Is it not rather of that whole Church excepting these few Names mentioned *verse* 4. Chap. 3. *which had not defiled their Garments*? Yes certainly, and so the forecited *Augustin* saies, and gives it for a general Rule, much after the same Way with *Ambrose* before cited, 'That because *Angel* signifies a *Messenger*, therefore whoever either 'Bishop or Presbyter or even Lay-Man speaks frequently of God 'and tells Men how They may come to eternal Life, is deservedly called the Angel of God (t). 6thly, When he saies to the Angel of the Church in *Philadelphia*, *I have set before Thee an open Door,--- Thou hast a little Strength, and hast kept my Word &c.* Did He mean thereby to characterize a single Person? No, 'tis plain it is the Character of the Church, and so the forecited *Augustin* expressly saies (u). Indeed there is not one Clause in the whole Epistle that so much as seems to describe a single Person, yea even that

[q] Edit. Colonix Agrippinæ. 1661. [r] Sancti Prædicatores.--- Cap. 1. ad finem. Septem igitur Angelos, Rectores septem Ecclesiarum debemus intelligere, eo quod Angelus NUNTIUS interpretatur. Et qui Verbum Dei populo annuntiant, non inconvenienter ANGELI, id est, NUNTII vocantur. Et sicut per septem Ecclesias, una Ecclesia Catholica, ita per septem Rectores septem Ecclesiarum omnes Rectores Ecclesie Catholice designantur. [s] Edit. folio Londini. Anno 1592.

[t] Nam quia etiam Angelus Nuncius interpretatur, quicumque aut Episcopus aut Presbyter aut etiam Laicus frequenter de Deo loquitur, & quomodo ad vitam æternam perveniatur annuntiat, merito Angelus Dei dicitur. Hom. 2. in Apoc.

[u] Hoc ideo dictum est, ut nullus dicat, quia ostium quod Deus aperit Ecclesie, in toto mundo aliquis possit vel in parte claudere. Hom. 3. Ibid. ..

that Promise *verse 9. Behold I will make them of the Synagogue of Satan to come and Worship before thy Feet*, imports Nothing of peculiar Priviledge to the Bishop, but meerly signifies the Effect that the Preaching of the Gospel should have upon these Enemies, as the forecited *Ambrose* explains it (x). Lastly, the like is to be said of the Church of *Laodicea* in the whole Epistle to the Angel thereof there is not one Clause that Characterizes a *single* Person. I add further, that in *none* of these *seven* Epistles is there *one* Act of *Episcopal* Jurisdiction so much as *hinted* at; not *any* Act which is nor competent to *all* the Ministers of the Gospel, yea indeed to the *People* themselves; for Instance; when it is said of the Church of *Ephesus* Chap. 2 *ver. 2.* ‘Thou hast tryed them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them Liars; it is no more than what is the Duty, and will be the Practice of every good Christian; all being enjoined *1 John 4. 1.* ‘Beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they are of God’ because many false Prophets are gone out into the World. Again, when the Church of *Thyatira* is blamed for *suffering that Woman Jezabel*, every Christian may be guilty of the like, being discharged to own or countenance Infamous and Obstinate Hereticks. *2 John 10.* ‘If there come any unto you and bring not this Doctrine, receive Him not into your House, neither bid him God Speed. Besides, several Authors relate, and Dr. *Fulk* against the *Rhemists* upon the Place takes notice of it, that the said *Jezabel* was the Bishop’s Wife; though I do not believe this, because I am very sure that there was no such thing as a *Bishop* in the Modern Sense at that Time; yet, upon that Supposition, His Fault would have been rather a Neglect of his Marital Authority than of his Episcopal Power; consequently it cannot be inferred thence that he is described there as a *Governour* of the Church. Upon the whole then, Mr. *Rhind* has been too unwary, and His *Forwardness* has mightily outrun his *Judgment* when he asserted, That these Angels are *characterized* in the 2d and 3d Chapters of the Revelation as *single* Persons Dr. *Hammond* Himself, though so earnest

[x] Id est, cum crediderint per verba tua in me, adorabunt ante Pedes tuos, deprecantes, ut per vitam eternam consequantur. *Ambros.* ubi supra, &c.

to have these Angels believed to be *single* Persons, yet ~~he~~ had not Courage enough to affirm, that They are *characterized* there as such, nay indeed he confesses the contrary (*y*). ‘ Though the ‘ Angels, *saith He*, were single Persons, yet *what is said to them is* ‘ *not said only to their Persons, but to the Universality of the People* ‘ *under them*, whose Non-Proficiency, or Remission of Degrees of ‘ Christian Virtue, especially their falling off from the Constancy ‘ and Courage of their Profession, do deserve (and are according- ‘ ly threatned with) the Removal of that Christian Knowledge, ‘ that Grace, those Priviledges of a Church which had been allow- ‘ ed them, C. 2. 5. *which is not so properly applicable, as a Punishment* ‘ *of the Bishop, as of the People under him*. And therefore in the ‘ *Paraphrase* I have generally changed the singular into the plural ‘ number, by that means to leave it *indifferently to the Bishop of each* ‘ *Church and the People under Him*, and yet further to the other ‘ Churches subordinate to each of the *Metropoles* here named. Thus Dr. *Hammond*. And elsewhere (*z*) He is forced to acknowledge, That ‘ those Expressions, which are used in the singular Num- ‘ ber, do not all belong to the Bishop, but to the Church where- ‘ in he presides. The very Truth is Dr. *Hammond* has absolutely destroyed this Argument of the Apocalyptick Angels. For First, He has made them not simply *Bishops*, but *Metropolitans*, a Notion wherein his whole Party, I believe, have now deserted him; yet he very Judiciously saw that the Argument could not be so much as coloured without some such Notion. 2dly, He elsewhere (*a*) makes a twofold Bishop in the same Place; of which the one was set over the *Jewish* and the other over the *Gentile* Christians. How then could these Angels be *single* Persons? Were the Epistles written only to the circumcised, or only to the uncircumcised? But to go on with Mr. *Rhind*.

Fifthly, Is it true *that all the Authors Ancient and Modern who have commented upon the 2d and 3d Chap. of the Revelation have supposed these Angels to be single Persons and the Governors of these Churches?* I suppose this Question may be abundantly satisfied from what I have already

[*y*] Annot. in Rev. Chap. 1. v. 20. [*z*] Vind. of the Dissert. Chap. I. Sect. 11.

[*a*] Preamonition to the second Epistle of S. John.

already discoursed : For we have heard *Arethas*, *Ambrose*, *Augustin* applying the Seven Epistles to the whole Collective Body of the Church. *Arethas* is an uncontested Author; of *Ambrose* I have spoke before. The only Question is about *Augustin* whether these *Homilies* on the *Revelation*, which I have cited, are indeed his. But this Question does not affect the Controversie. For, though *Erasmus* (b) suspects them not to be *Augustin's*, yet it is agreed on all Hands that they are the Work of an *Ancient* Writer, which sufficiently confutes Mr. *Rhind*. And besides these, if Mr. *Rhind's* Memory had served him, which one might have expected after his telling that he had studied the Controversie with a *Scrupulous Exactness*, He might have remembred that there are many other Authors both Ancient and Modern insisted on by the *Presbyterians* (c) viz. *Ambrosius Anbertus* (whom some mistake for the *Ambrose* whom I have cited) *Primasius*, *Gregory the Great*, *Haymo*, *Beda*, *Richard*, *Thomas*, *Fulk*, *Fox* and *Perkins*. But Mr. *Rhind* made choice of the easiest Way of doing his Business: For who would undergo the Drudgery of examining Things that imagines His Reader is to be put off with bold and blind Assertion? We have indeed very few *Ancient* Writers on the *Apocalypse*. It was some Time before it was Universally received as Canonical, and the Commentaries of such as wrote upon it, (such as *Justin Martyr* and *Irénaus*) in the first three Centuries are now lost; and though such as wrote upon it afterward, when *Prelacy* turned Rampant, had interpreted according to the *Episcopal* Scheme, it cou'd make no Argument against the *Presbyterians*: But when the Evidence of Truth, notwithstanding that Temptation, forced them to interpret, as we have heard them doing; it is an irreparable Loss to the *Episcopal* Cause. And for Mr. *Rhind* to alledge at random, that all Authors both *Ancient* and *Modern* are on the *Episcopal* Side, without citing, nay without so much as nameing any one of them, except *Beza* alone, of whom just now, was to be too Prodigal of the Credit of his Judgment, and is no great Argument of the Discretion of His Brethren who Midwif'd His Book into the World.

Lastly,

[b] Prefat. ad Lect. Non videtur *Augustini*, quatenus opus lectu dignum. (c) Gersom *Interp.* 2. 4. 2. Alt. *Damaſ. Cap.* 4. p. 93. 99. Naz. *Queren.* Pan. 24. Sect. 5. *Smeſymon.* Sect. 13. &c.

Lastly, Has *Beza* said any Thing upon this Argument that favours the *Episcopal* Cause? Mr. *Rhind* brings him in with a great Deal of Parade as if he were clear on the *Episcopal* Side. But why did he not cite his Words? Why does he give us his own Commentary without *Beza's* Text? Why truly there was Reason for it. *Beza's* Words are these (d). 'To the Angel, that is, to the President (or Moderator) whom, to wit, it behoved in the first Place to be admonished concerning these Matters, and by him the rest of the *Colleagues*, and so the whole Church. But from thence to infer the *Episcopal* Degree, which was afterwards brought into the Church of God by Human Inventions, is what neither can nor ought to be done. Nay, not that that Office of President or Moderator should necessarily be perpetual, as the Oligarchical Tyranny (whose Head is the Antichristian Beast) which arose thence now makes it manifest, with the most certain Ruin, not only of the whole Church but World also. Judge now, good Reader, of Mr. *Rhind's* Modesty, and say whether *Beza* is on the *Episcopal* Side. If he cou'd find Testimonies of *Presbyterian* Authors on his Side, I'm sure he is sufficiently qualified to improve them, when he could be so confident on a Testimony that was clearly against him.

So much for the Argument from the *Apocalyptick Angels*, And I hope I may appeal to the Reader if ever he knew any more senseless or more groundless used by any Party on any Cause: For, supposing it were plain even to a Demonstration, that these Angels were single Persons, yet where is there the least Intimation that these single Persons had the Sole Power either of *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction*; or even a *Negative* over the *Presbyters* in these things? Without this it can be no Argument for the Modern *Episcopacy*. Yet so true is it that there is no Intimation thereof, that Dr. *Hammond* will not allow that there were any meer *Presbyters* at that Time, wherein he is certainly right. And as that Notion quite destroys the Argument from the *Apocalyptick Angels*, so Dr. *Whitby* has observed (e) That the same Notion destroys

(d) *Beza* in *Apocalyp.* 2. 1. Angelo, idest, πρῶτος, quem oportuit nimirum imprimis de his rebus admoneri, ac peream ceteros Collegas, totamque adeo Ecclesiam. Sed hinc statui Episcopalis ille Gradus, postea humanitus in Ecclesiam Dei invehitus, certe nec potest nec debet. Imo ne perpetuum quidem istud πρῶτος & minus esse necessario oportuisse, sicut exorta inde Tyrannis Oligarchica [cujus Apex est Antichristiana bestia] ceratissima eam totius, non Ecclesie modo, sed etiam Orbis Pernicie nunc tandem declarat.

[e] Annot. on 1 Peter 5. 1.

troys two other Arguments already adduced by Mr. Rhind, and ordinarily insisted on by the *Episcopal* Writers viz. That from the *Form of Government which obtain'd among the Jews*; and the other from the *Subordination of the Seventy to the Twelve*. 'If saith he, the Middle Order had been wanting so long as is supposed, viz. by Dr. Hammond, the Government of the Church would not have been formed after that (the *Jewish*) Plat Form; which, as *Epiphanius* and the *Jews* inform us, had these several Offices in it, The same may be said of those who make the Elders or *Presbyters* to be answerable to the *Seventy*, appointed by Christ as inferiour Officers under the Apostles, and make this an Argument of an Inequality betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, established in the Church by Christ. Thus Dr. Whitby. The *Presbyterians* then are obliged to Dr. Hammond for casing them of three the most noisie Arguments of their Adversaries.

ARTICLE V.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof of Prelacy from Testimonies of Antiquity, is Examined.

From P. 85. to P. 111.

HAVING cleared our Hands of the Arguments from the Scripture, we proceed next to consider the Testimonies from *Antiquity*. Mr. Rhind is at a great deal of Pains for six Pages together to perswade the *Presbyterians* to appeal to the Ancients; and runs through all the common Places of Rhetorick to shew how competent and unexceptionable Witnesses they are. But all this is wretched Affectation: For First, the *Episcopal* Authors themselves own that the *Presbyterians* have the Fathers on their side. We heard before Dr. Bedell justifying *Medina* in owning that *Ambrose*, *Augustin*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodore*,

doret, *Oecumenius* and *Theophylact* are on the *Presbyterian* Side. This then was only a Stroke of Mr. *Rhinda's* Politicks to gull his Reader into a Belief that the Fathers are against the *Presbyterians*. 2dly, In all Cases the *Presbyterians* are content to be concluded by the Testimony of the Fathers, or to give a good Reason why they cannot. And I know no Class of Christians that goes further, or gives an implicate Assent to their Dictates. The Fathers Themselves required no such Thing of such as were to come after them, and in a Thousand Places have desired their Readers to try before they trusted. And I'm sure there is abundance of Reason for doing so. For there is no Man that has dipped ever so little into the Study of 'em, but is convinced, that any that would swallow their Doctrines by the Lump must at once believe the greatest absurdities and most palpable Contradictions; and none have noticed this with greater Freedom than the Church of *England* Divines. ' The Scripture, *saieth* Dr. *Sherlock* (f) is all of a Piece, every ' Part of it agrees with the rest; the Fathers many Times contradict themselves and each other: ' And He tells, how it has often ' made him smile, with a Mixture of Pity and Indignation to see ' what a great Noise the *Roman* Disputants made among Women ' and Children and the meanest sort of people with Quotations ' out of Fathers and Councils, whom they pretend to be all on ' their Side. I shall be glad if this be not the Character of some other Folks as well as the *Roman* Disputants. To the same Purpose the Incomparable *Chillingworth* (g). ' I for my part, *saieth* ' He, after a long, and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial ' Search of the true way to Eternal Happiness, do profess plainly, ' that I cannot find any rest for the Sole of my Feet, but upon this ' Rock only, viz. the Scripture. I see plainly and with my own Eyes, ' Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a Consent of Fathers of one Age against a ' Consent of Fathers of another Age, and the Church of one Age ' against the Church of another Age. Thus He. And thus from two of the greatest Men the Church of *England* cou'd ever boast of

[f] Preservative against Popery Part I Chap. 2d Sect. 3d.

[g] Prot. Rel. a Safe way Chap. VI Sect. 56.

of we may learn what habile Witnesses the Fathers are, and how great Weight will hang upon their Testimony: For, if such a Character of the Fathers be both Sense and Truth in the Mouths of these great Men when disputing against the *Romanists*, is it possible but it must be the same in the Mouths of *Presbyterians* when disputing against the *Prelatists*? But indeed the *Presbyterians* need no such Common-Place Considerations for defending themselves. So far as Mr. Rhind has gone I am content the Debate be compromised, and referred to the Fathers and the Testimony of Antiquity.

He insists on Five viz. *Ignatius*, *Clemens Romanus*, the Emperour *Adrian*, *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*. All which I shall consider in Order.

The First is *Ignatius*, ' who, saith He p. 91,
' was constituted Bishop of *Antioch*, upon *IGNATIUS*
' the Death of *Evodius*, the immediate Success-
' or of Saint *Peter*, and who in His *Epistles* testifies most favourably
' for *Episcopacy*. To which it is answered. In the first Place.
'Tis ridiculous to affirm that S. *Peter* was Bishop of *Antioch*; the Apostolick Character and Office being inconsistent with the fixed Charge of any particular See. 2dly, Supposing it had not been so, yet both *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret* (h) affirm *Ignatius* to have succeeded immediately not to *Evodius* but to *Peter* himself. But waving these Things, I answer Thirdly, That the *Epistles* of *Ignatius* are so far from testifying favourably for the Modern *Episcopacy*, that they quite destroy it, and the Principles upon which it is pretended to be built. This I hope to make good to every Man's Conviction by the FOUR following Particulars.

In the First Place. Supposing that *Episcopacy* had obtain'd at the Time when *Ignatius* wrote His *Epistles*, yet this is so far from being an Argument that it had obtain'd in the Apostolick Age, that the whole strain of these *Epistles* are an Evidence of the contrary. This, I am aware, will at first be thought a very surprizing Assertion: But I shall make it good from an unexception-

Q 2

able

[h] *Chrysost. de Translat. S. Ignatii. Theodor. de Immur. Dial. 1.*

able Hand, I mean Mr. *Dodwell* (i). The matter in Short is this. The *Presbyterians* had oftimes excepted against the *Ignatian* Epistles either as not Genuine, or at least as vitiat and corrupted, On this Head, because they insist so much on the Absolute Power of the Bishop; they could not believe that such *Rhodomontado* Expressions as are used on that Subject were consistent with the Spirit, Character or Circumstances of *Ignatius* when he wrote his Epistles. Mr. *Dodwell* saw the Force of this Objection; and therefore carefully applies Himself to take it off. But how does he it? Plainly by telling us, that the Reason, why *Ignatius* insisted so much on the Power of the Bishop, was because *Episcopacy* was an Order but newly introduced into the Church, that therefore it was necessary that with all His might He should assert their new Rights, and urge and establish a Power formerly unknown. In a Word, *Episcopacy* was not instituted, says Mr. *Dodwell*, till the Year *CVI*. *Ignatius* wrote His Epistles in the Year 116 saies Bishop *Lloyd*, in the Year 110 saies *Eusebius*, in the Year 107 saies Bishop *Usher*. By the longest of these Accounts *Episcopacy* was but of ten years standing when *Ignatius* wrote, and by the shortest of them but of one. And now let the Reader say if these Epistles will prove that *Episcopacy* obtain'd in the Apostolick Age.

Secondly, I ask Mr. *Rhind* if any where in these Epistles He finds a Bishop that had more than one Congregation under His Charge. The Episcopal Writers have oftimes been called on to shew this; they have never done it to this Day, and I believe no wise man will ever attempt it: For Nothing is more plain from these Epistles, than that the Bishops whole Charge met in one Place and communicate at one Altar. Whether then does this look like the *Scots* Presbyterian or the *English* Diocefan Bishop?

Thirdly, Through all the *Ignatian* Epistles, as I have shewn before, the *Presbyters* are always said to represent the Apostles, the *Bishops* never. Now upon this I ask 1st How Mr. *Rhina's* Argument

[1] Paranes Sect. 25. p. 105. 106. Hinc etiam constat, nullam fuisse (quam Crediderunt *Ignatianum* Epistoliarum Adversarij, nostrarum rationum necij) Affectationem, immo necessarium fuisse, ut nova *Протоиерей* jura enixis viribus assererentur.--- Nam prima Potestas illius in Episcopos devotione magis necessarium erat ut ignota antea Potestas urgeretur atque stabileretur.---Nostra autem Rationes ostendunt jam nuperam fuisse illam Episcoporum Potestatem, Cum adeo illam Commendaret *Ignatius*.

ment holds that the *Bishops* succeed the *Apostles*, and the *Presbyters* the *Seventy*. 2dly, If the *Presbyters* succeed the *Apostles*, how is it possible but that they must have the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction as well as of Preaching and dispensing the Sacraments? Surely the *Apostles* had it, how then can the *Presbyters* their Successors want it? 3dly, Seeing by the *Ignatian* Doctrine the *Presbyters* were in Place of the *Apostles*, How is it True that the *Presbyters* cannot do any Pastoral act in their own Right, but as the *Bishops* Delegates. The *Apostles* had our Lord Jesus Christ for their Immediate Superior, why should it be otherwise with the *Presbyters* their Successors?

Fourthly. The *Ignatian* Presbytry had a Share in the Government, as appears from many Places of these Epistles. ‘ And that being Subject to your Bishop and his *Presbytry*, ye may be wholly and thoroughly sanctified (k). Obeying your Bishop and the *Presbytry* with intire Affection (l). But be ye united to your Bishop and those who preside over you, that is, the *Presbyters* (m). So neither do ye any thing without your Bishop and *Presbyters* (n). But he that is without, that is, does any Thing without the Bishop *Presbyters* and Deacons, is not pure in his Conscience (o). Being Subject to your Bishop as to the Command of God and so likewise to the *Presbytry*. (p) Thus it was in the *Ignatian* Times. But where now is there any such Thing as this in the Church of England which Mr. Rhind has joined? Are not the *Presbyters* entirely deprived of the Exercise of Discipline? Nay are not the *Lay Chancellours* risen up against the Bishops themselves their Creators? Have they not engrossed the Discipline wholly into their Hands? Hear Dr. Burnet (q) even before he became Revolutioner. ‘ Our Ecclesiastical Courts, saith he, are not in the Hands of our Bishops and their Clergy, but put over to the *Civilians*, where too often Fees are more strictly looked after than the Correction of Manners.... Excommunication has become a Kind of Secular Sentence, and is hardly now considered as a Spiritual Censure, being judged and given out by Lay Men, and often upon

[k] Ep. to the Ephes. Sect. II. [l] Ibid. Sect. XX. [m] Ep. to the Magnes. Sect. VI. [n] Ibid. Sect. VII. [o] Ep. to the Tral. Sect. VII. [p] Ibid. Sect. XIII. [q] Pricaceto II. Vol. Hist. Reform.

* upon Grounds, which, to speak moderately, do not merit so severe and dreadfull a Sentence. Before I go further I cannot but take Notice that Mr. Rhind, in summing up the Evidence from Ignatius's Epistles, has not dealt fairly when he saies p. 94. *That this Exercise of the Episcopal Authority over subordinate Presbyters and Deacons was not peculiar to the Churches to which S. Ignatius directed his Epistles, but did EXTEND (to use that Saints Words) to the utmost Bounds of the Earth; which, saith he, in my Opinion, asserts the UNIVERSAL Exercise of the Episcopal Office.* Did Ignatius use that Word EXTEND, I mean the Greek that signifies it? If not how can the UNIVERSAL EXERCISE of the Episcopal Office be inferred upon it? And yet 'tis certain first that He did not use it but a Greek Word * which signifies *Defined or Appointed*, and that too without any Mention of the Earth in the Clause. Secondly, That Bishops did not at that Time extend to the utmost Bounds of the Earth: For, Mr. Dodwell gives it as the very Reason why Ignatius insisted so much on the Episcopal Authority, because it had not yet universally obtained. 'The Power of the Bishops, saith He (r), was so long to be urged till it should be universally received, and Men were brought in Use to obey it. Why then did Mr. Rhind in his Reasoning use the Word EXTEND instead of APPOINTED, especially when before p. 93 He had used the Word APPOINTED in citing? Did he not design to take Advantage of his Reader's Inadvertency? But how shall his Conclusion of the Universal Exercise of the Episcopal Office in Ignatius's Time stand, when it is founded upon a false Bottom? This now is our first Defence against the Ignatian Epistles, that they quite destroy the Modern Episcopacy and the Principles on which it is built, which I must needs still believe they do, till I have got a satisfying Answer to the former Particulars. I add

Secondly, That these Ignatian Epistles, as to the main of the Controversie, contain Nothing contrary to the Presbyterian Scheme. And it is

* ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπισκοποὶ οἱ κατὰ τὰ πρῶτα ὁρισθέντες

[1] Parænes. Sect. 25. p. 106. Tantisper certe urgenda erat nova illa Potestas dum a Subditis passim reciperetur, & dum illius Obsequio Homines assueverunt.

is a great Encouragement to me to venture on that Assertion that
 so great a Man as *Stillingfleet* has done it before me. ' In all those
 ' thirty five Testimonies, *saith he (s)*, produced out of *Ignatius's* Epistles
 ' for Episcopacy, I can meet but with one which is brought to prove
 ' the least Semblance of an Institution of Christ for Episcopacy, and
 ' if I be not much deceived, the Sense of that Place is clearly mista-
 ' ken too---. I said, *as to the main of the Controversie*, to prevent trif-
 ' fling in any Body that shall attempt to answer this. Mr. *Rhind* al-
 ' ludes on the Presbyterians that they affirm the *Ignatian Bishop* to cor-
 ' respond to their Parish Minister ; the Presbyters and Deacons to their Rul-
 ' ing Elders and Deacons. p. 101. I do not know any Presbyterian Au-
 ' thor that ever wrote so widely, I do not believe ever any of them
 ' did, and want to have them named. But if any of them ever did so,
 ' I here enter my Dissent from them. 'Tis certain the *Presbyterian*
 ' Deacons do not correspond to the *Ignatian* Deacons, because the *Ig-
 ' natian* Deacons do not correspond to the *Scripture* Deacons. 'Tis evi-
 ' dent from *Acts 6* that the Deacons were instituted to serve Tables,
 ' and take Care of the Poor and of the Churches Stock. The very Rea-
 ' son of their Institution was the giving Relief to the Apostles, who
 ' could not at once attend the Word of God and serve Tables. And to
 ' this Mr. *Dodwell* accords (t) declaring that the first Institution of
 ' the Office of Deaconship was for the distributing of the Treasures of
 ' the Church. But such is not the *Ignatian* Deacon : For, *saith He*
 ' (v), the Deacons are not the Ministers of Meat and Drink but of the
 ' Church. 'Tis certain likewise that the *Presbyterian* Parish Mini-
 ' ster does not correspond to the *Ignatian* Bishop as to His Intensive
 ' Power. The Presbyterians believe that the Power ascribed to the
 ' *Ignatian* Bishop is greater than ought to be allowed to any Crea-
 ' ture that is not under an Infallible Conduct. For Instance, when
 ' it is said † *Whatsoever the Bishop approves is acceptable to God*. But
 ' then I affirm that the *Ignatian* Bishop as to His Extensive Power
 ' corresponds better to the *Presbyterian* Parish Minister than to the
 ' *English* Diocesan Bishop, seeing, as I observed before, the *Ignatian*
 ' Bishop's whole Charge did meet in one Place and communicate at
 ' one

[s] *Irenic.* p. 309. Edit. I. [t] One Priesthood, Chap. XII. Sect. 3. p. 335. [v] Ep. to the Tral
 Sect. 2. † Ep. to the Smyrn. Sect. VIII. ...

one Altar. I affirm likewise, that there is not the least Hint in all the *Ignatian* Epistles of an Imparity among the Pastors of the Church, I take *Pastors* here in the current Ecclesiastical Sense of that Word for *such as labour in the Word and Doctrine*, for otherwise I know that the Word *Pastor* may signify any Officer or Governour whatsoever.

And this now brings me to the main Point in Debate: For I know the Reader will presently ask, what I make of the *Ignatian* Presbyters, were not they Pastors in the current Ecclesiastical Sense of that Word? I affirm positively that there is no Hint in all the *Ignatian* Epistles that they were, and that nothing Mr. *Rhind* has produced proves that there is any such Hint in them. He has but two Arguments for that Purpose, and that I may not wrong him, I shall set them down fully in his own Words.

The first runs thus p. 103. ' I say, that the Presbyters mentioned by *Ignatius*, did preach and administrate the Sacraments: Thus in the Epistle to the *Smyrn*. Let that Eucharist be looked upon as firm and just, which is either offered by the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has given his Consent. Again, 'Tis not lawfull without the Bishop, neither to Baptize nor to celebrate the Sacrament, but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also well pleasing to God; which plainly proves, that though the Bishop was invested with the Chief Power of Dispensing these Holy Ordinances, yet might the Presbyters perform them by his Allowance, and therefore they were not Elders according to the *Presbyterian* Fashion; seeing they pretend to no such Power, nor can their Parish Minister (who, they say, is the true *Ignatian* Bishop) communicate the same to them. Thus he.

Before I answer directly, I must give a literal Translation of the two Passages produced by him from the Original*. The first runs thus, *Let that Eucharist be held firm, which is under the Bishop or to whom he shall permit.* The other runs thus, *It is not lawfull without the Bishop neither to Baptize, or to make a Love Feast. But whatever he shall approve*

* Γκείνη βραία ευχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἢ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἑσθῆ, ἢ ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ
ἢ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ. Καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρεῖται πρὸς βαπτίζαν, ἢ πρὸς ἀγάπην πυνυλλῆ' οὐκ ἐκείνῳ δοκιμάσθῃ
ἢ καὶ καὶ τῷ Ὁῶ ἐκρίστω.

prove, the same is also well-pleasing to God. Now I ask 1st, Is there in either of these Testimonies the least Intimation that the Presbyters did *Preach*? No. Neither the Word *Preaching*, nor any Thing Equivalent to it, is mentioned in either of them: Nor indeed any where else in these Epistles is *Preaching* ascribed to the Presbyter. 2^{dly}, Is there the least Intimation in either of these Testimonies that the Presbyters *administrate the Sacraments*? No. *Presbyters* are not so much as named in either of them, nor is there the least Hint given that either Baptizing or giving the Eucharist was more peculiar to the Presbyters than to any of the Laity. Upon the whole then it does not appear by these Testimonies, that the *Ignatian* Presbyters could either *Preach* or *administrate the Sacraments*.

I know nothing can be reposed to this, unless it be said, that it ought to be supposed that the Bishop would not give his *Consent* to any to Baptize or to make a Love Feast but to the Presbyters. But this is a plain begging the Question, and is contrary to what the Fathers have taught us: For, saith *Ambrose* or *Hilary* the Roman Deacon who wrote the Commentaries annexed to *Ambrose's* Works (x) 'that the *Christian People* might encrease and be multiplied, in the Beginning
' it was allowed to all Persons both to preach the Gospel, and to Baptize, and to explain the Scriptures in the Church. And particularly as to Baptism 'tis known that it was usually dispensed by Lay Persons and *Tertullian* expressly asserts the Lawfulness of it, as we shall Hear when we come to his Testimony; and the forecited *Ambrose* or *Hilary* relates the Practice of it even in the Presence of the Apostles.
' At first, saith he (y), all Taught, and all Baptized on whatever Days
' or Times Occasion offered. For *Philip* did not wait for a Time
' or a Day in which he might Baptize the *Eunuch*, neither did he interpose a Fast. Nor did *Paul* and *Silas* delay but that they instantly Baptized the Jaylour with all his House. Neither had *Peter*
' Deacons, or sought a Day wherein to Baptize *Cornelius* with all his
R House:

[x] Ut ergo cresceret Plbs & multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est & evangelizare, & Baptizare, & Scripturas in Ecclesia explanare. *Ambros.* Vol. 1. Tom. 3. p. 239. in *Ephes.* cap. IV.

[y] Primum enim omnes docebant, & omnes baptizabant, quibuscunque diebus iussit Occasio. Nec enim Philippus tempus quaesivit aut diem quo Eunuchum baptizaret, neque Jejunium interposuit. Neque Paulus & Silas tempus distulerunt quo Optionem Carceris baptizarent cum omnibus suis. Neque Petrus Diaconos habuit, aut diem quaesivit quando Cornelium cum omni Domo ejus baptizavit. Nec ipse, sed baptizare iussit matribus qui cum illo ierant ad Cornelium ab Joppe. *Ambros.* ubi supra.

House: Nor did he himself Baptize them, but commanded the Brethren who came with Him from Joppa to do it. Thus he. One then might as well say that the *English* Midwives are *Presbyters*, because they have at least the Connivance of the Bishop to Baptize; as say, that these in *Ignatius* who Baptized with the Bishop's Consent were *Presbyters*, when not only Deacons might do it; which Mr. *Rhind* himself will not deny, but every Lay Person too. And as to the other Sacrament viz: the Eucharist there is no Mention in either of the two Testimonies of *Consecrating* it, and as for the *Distribution* of it, 'tis certain that not only Deacons but even Lay Persons used to be employed about it. Thus *Chrysostom* tells us (z) 'That it was given in Charge to the Deacons to keep notoriously unworthy Persons from the Table, and that the Holy Gifts should not be distributed to them. And by the Fourth Council of *Carthage* (a) it is allowed that in Case of Necessity the Deacon, the Presbyter being present, may being ordered give the Eucharist of the Body of Christ to the People. And *Justin Martyr* (b) tells us that it was usual in his Days for the Deacons to carry the Eucharist to the Absents. But not the Deacons only, but even Lay Persons were sometimes thus employed. Thus *Eusebius* tells us (c) of *Serapion* that desiring the Eucharist on his Death Bed, He sent his Grand Child to bring a Presbyter to administer it to him. The Presbyter happened to be sick and was not able to come; but he sent the Eucharist with the Boy ordering him to administer it to his Grand Father which accordingly was done. And who knows not that the Eucharist used to be given to Infants after their Baptism? But I very much doubt if there was always a Church Officer at the doing of it. Plainly the Elements used to be consecrated by the Bishop, and the People oft times kept them, and by his allowance gave them to others. How then does it appear from the Testimonies produced by Mr. *Rhind*, that the *Ignatian Presbyters* did either Preach or Administrate the Sacraments, when there

[z] Homil. 82. in Evang. Matth.

[a] Ut Diaconus presente Presbytero Eucharistiam Corporis Christi Populo, si necessitas Cogat, jussu Eroget. Can. 38. Caenana. Sum. Concil.

[b] Apol. 2. p. 97. Edit. Coloune. 1686. .

[c] Hist. Eccles. Lib. 6. Cap. 43. .

there is neither Mention in either of them of *Presbyters*; nor, suppose there were, is there any Thing ascribed to them but what might be and was frequently done by *Deacons*, yea by every *Lay Christian*? So much for his first Argument.

His Second is in these Words p. 103, 104. ‘ But I add, that the *Presbyters* in St. *Ignatius’s* Days, were Subject to the Bishop: This does fully appear from the Testimonies formerly cited: If then these *Presbyters* were such as the Modern Ruling Elders, either this their Subjection must relate to the Bishop’s Superior Power in the Administration of Sacraments and Ordination, or to the Power of Jurisdiction: Not the former; for how can they be accountable in these respects, when they are not supposed to be at all concern’d in these Matters; and to say that this Subjection relates to Acts of Jurisdiction, is to destroy that Parity of Power, of which all *Presbyters*, whether Preaching or Ruling are equally possessed according to the *Presbyterians*. Thus he.

The Answer to which is very easie, and therefore may be very Short. Through all the *Ignatian* Epistles there is no Subjection required from the *Presbyters* to the Bishop but what every Presbyterian Ruling Elder will own, and that too, agreeably to Presbyterian Principles, to be his Duty to pay to the Minister. Every Presbyterian Ruling Elder owns the Minister to be an Officer Superior to himself as having the Key of *Doctrine* as well as of *Discipline*, whereas himself has that of *Discipline* only. Every Presbyterian Ruling Elder gives, though not a Negative, yet the Precedency to the Minister in all Acts of Jurisdiction. In a Word every Presbyterian Ruling Elder is ready to yeild all *Reverence* to the Minister, which is all that is required of the *Ignatian* *Presbyter* to the Bishop. So much for his Second Argument. And this is our Second Defence against the *Ignatian* Epistles, That, as to the Main of the Controversie, they contain Nothing contrary to the Presbyterian Scheme. And I hope every Reader is satisfied that there is no more needfull on this Subject. Yet because Mr. *Rhind* mentions another Defence which the Presbyterians make against them viz. That these Epistles are either Spurious or Corrupted: Tho’ I do not think such a Defence needfull, yet I homologate the same, and justify my Brethren in it. And therefore

In the Third Place. I assert that these Epistles which go under the Name of *Ignatius* either are not Genuine, or at least that they are vitiate and interpolated. For proving this, I am not to insist on what the Learned *Stillingfleet* has suggested (*d*) that the Story of transporting *Ignatius* from *Antioch* where he was condemned, to *Rome* where he suffered, and of his many Excursions by the Way, and of the Freedom he got to write these Epistles, smells rank of the Legend; seeing *Ignatius* himself informs us that *He was bound to ten Leopards, that is to say, to such a Band of Soldiers; who, though treated with all manner of Kindness, were the worst for it.* Waving this, I affirm that nothing Mr. *Rhind* has advanced, though he has taken very great pains on this Particular, is in the least sufficient to vindicate them.

He insists on these Six Topicks. I. That several Fathers do mention these Epistles, and cite sundry Passages from them which are to be found in those now extant. II. That *Calvin* who was a Party was the first who ever alledged such an Interpolation. III. That at least *Vossius's* and *Usher's* Editions of these Epistles are the Genuine Issue of that Holy Father. IV. That such an Interpolation was hardly if at all Practicable. V. That the alledging that these Passages which assert the Episcopal Authority are Interpolations is a mean begging of the Question. VI. That no one can give a reasonable account why any such Interpolation should have been attempted. Of each of these in order.

I. He alledges p. 95. 96. *S. Polycarp, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius and Theodoret.* All which, saith he, with many other Authors do mention these Epistles and cite sundry Passages from them which are to be found in those now extant. To which it is answered, that this proves only that *Ignatius* did write Epistles, and that some Sentences of them are still preserved. But how will it follow thence, either that these Epistles are Genuine, or that they are not vitiated? Especially when we consider. 1st, That all the Passages cited from *Ignatius* by the Ancients are not to be found even in the best Editions of him which we have. For Instance, there is a
Passage

[d] Ep. to the Romans Sect. 5.

Passage cited by *Ierom* thus (f). *Ignatius an Apostolick Man and Martyr writes boldly, The Lord chased Apostles who were Sinners above all Men.* Now, in which of the *Ignatian Epistles* is there any such Passage to be found? Dr. *Hammond* answers (g), *That it may well be his saying, though it is not found in these Epistles: Just as Our Saviour spake many Things which are not written in the Gospels.* But this is a mere Whim; for *Ierom* is not testifying about what *Ignatius* spoke but about what he wrote. This is a pretty good Presumption that the *Epistles* are at least mutilate. 2dly, If the Ancients citing of him be an Argument, Is it not very strange that no one of them has cited these Passages that are insisted on in Favours of Episcopacy? Is it not strange that his Authority was never insisted on in the Dispute with *Aerius* where there was so fair Occasion for it? Wou'd not one be tempted from this to think that such Passages are toisted in? 3dly, Some of these Expressions that the Ancients cite which are now found in these *Epistles* are neither cited as from *Ignatius*, nor as from *Epistles* either of his or any Body else. For Instance, that Passage which Mr. *Rhind* p. 95. cites from *Irenaeus*, *I am the Wheat of God and shall be ground by the Teeth of wild Beasts, that I may become the Bread of Jesus Christ*, though it is found in *Ignatius's Epistles*, yet *Irenaeus* does not say that it was written, much less that it was written in an *Epistle*, least of all that it was written in any *Epistle* from *Ignatius*, but only indefinitely, *One of our Brethren hath said* (h), which *Eusebius* understands of *Ignatius*.

II. He alledges p. 97. that *the Presbyterians cannot name an Author whoever alledged such an interpolation before Calvin, whom all Men know to have been a Party.* And this (he thinks) might be allowed a sufficient Answer. This sufficient Answer of his is to gross an imposing upon People's Understanding, that I am even amazed he shou'd have been so very Prodigal of his Credit. The Matter is plainly this. *Calvin* wrote that excellent Book of his *Institutions* in the Year 1536.

There-

[f] *Ignatius vir Apostolicus et Martyr scribit Audacter, Eligit Dominus Apostolos, qui super omnes Homines Peccatores erant.* Hierom Dial. 3. con. Pelag. [g] Ant. to the Animadver. on the Dissert. Chap. 3. Sect. 1.

[h] *Quemadmodum quidam de nostris dixit, propter Martyrium in Deum adjudicatus ad Bestias. Quoniam frumentum &c.*

Therein he has Occasion to defend the Doctrine of the ever Blessed Trinity, against which Doctrine the *Antitrinitarians* objected the Authority and Testimony of *Ignatius*. *Calvin* in Answer thereto rejects (i) the said pretended Authority, and gives a very bad Character of the Work. ‘As for *Ignatius* (saith he) let these who attribute any Thing to his Authority prove that the Apostles made a Law about Lent and such like Corruptions: There is Nothing more stinking than that Trash which is published under the Name of *Ignatius*. Whence the Impudence of such is the less tolerable, who furnish themselves with such Forgeries wherewith to impose on the World. Now, will the Reader ask, Did *Calvin* find any such thing in *Ignatius* as Expressions against the Doctrine of the Trinity, a pretended Apostolick Law for observing *Lent* and such like Corruptions? Yes indeed, in the *Old Editions*, which alone were known in *Calvin’s* Time, there was a great deal of such Stuff; as even *Coke* a Church of *England* Divine has noticed (k). Thus, in the Epistle to those of *Tarsus*, it is mentioned as one of the Heresies disseminate by Satan, that *Christ was God over all*. And in the Epistle to the *Philippians*, it is denied that the Word which was made *Flesh* dwelt in Man. And it is asserted, that ‘if any fast on the Sabbath Day he is a Murderer of Christ; and that if any keep Easter with the Jews he is partaker with those who slew the Lord and his Apostles. And in the Epistle to the *Antiochians*, Wives are discharged to call their Husbands by their own proper Name. In a word, the Divines of the Church of *Rome* cited these Epistles to prove that the Blessed Virgin *Mary* was void of all Sin. I hope it is plain that as some of these Things were great *Fooleries*, so others of them were Gross *Heresies*. And must then *Calvin* be traduced as a *Party-Man* because he would not Sacrifice the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity to the Reputation of *Ignatius’s* Epistles? But let us hear *Dr. Wake* Bishop of *Lincoln* (l). ‘Before I enter upon that Account

[i] Ignatium quod obediunt, si velint quicquam habere momenti, probent Apostolos legem tulisse de Quadagesima &c. similibus Corruptelis: Nihil Nænijs illis quæ sub Ignatij nomine editæ sunt, puridius. Quo minus tolerabilis est eorum impudentia qui talibus Larvis ad fallendum se intraunt. *Calvin. Inscr. Lib. 1. Cap. 13. Sect. 29*

[k] Centura, quorundam Script. vet. (1) The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers II. Edit. p. 30.

' count which it will be fitting for me to give of the Epistles of
 ' S. *Ignatius*, it will be necessary for me to observe, that there have
 ' been considerable Differences in the *Editions* of the Epistles of this
 ' Holy Man; no less than in the Judgment of our latter Criticks
 ' concerning them. To pass by the *first*, and most imperfect of
 ' them, the *best* that for a *long* Time was *extant*, contained not
 ' only a *great* Number of Epistles *falsly* ascribed to this Author,
 ' but even those that were Genuine so altered and corrupted, *that*
 ' *it was hard to find out the true Ignatius in them.* The *first* that began
 ' to remedy this Confusion, and to restore this great Writer to
 ' His primitive Simplicity, was our most Reverend and Learned
 ' Arch Bishop *Usher*, in his *Edition* of them at *Oxford* Anno 1644.
 Thus Dr. *Wake*. Now if, by the Judgment of the most Learned
 of the Episcopalians; there was not so much as any tolerable Copy
 of the *Ignatian* Epistles *extant* till the Year 1644, that is, 108 Years
 after *Calvin* had excepted against them; who that has not thrown
 off all Modesty would talk at Mr *Rbind's* Rate, or would seek to
 blast the Fame of that Great Man *Calvin* in a Matter wherein the
 Episcopalians themselves have justified him; or would represent
 him as a *Party Man*, when he was defending the Common Cause
 of Christianity. But it seems *Ignatius's* Epistles must stand, though
 the Doctrine of the *Trinity* and the *Divinity* of our Blessed Savi-
 our should Sink. Dear Episcopacy, what art thou not worth! Who
 would not Sell even his Religion to purchase *Thee*, without which
 all Religion is Nothing?

III. He adds p. 97. ' That however the Name of the Holy
 ' Man *Ignatius* may have been abused by ignorant or designing
 ' Men, who fathered upon him their own spurious or interpolated
 ' Work, yet the Epistles of *Usher's* and *Vossius's* Edition are his Ge-
 ' nueine Issue. But does not Dr. *Wake* himself own (*m*) ' That no
 ' one that Reads (even these Editions of) them with *any* care or Judg-
 ' ment can make any doubt of it, but that Letters or Words have
 ' been mistaken, and perhaps even Pieces of some Sentences too
 ' corrupted. And does not every one know what a great Altera-
 ' tion the Mistake of one Letter-sometimes will make? I shall give

one

one signal Instance of this, which is related by Dr. Wake (*n*). In the *Acts* of the Martyrdom of S. Polycarp, as set out from the *Barroccian* Manuscript by Archbishop *Usher*, there is this Passage. ‘ That the ‘ Souldier or Officer having struck his Launce into the Side of the ‘ Saint, there came forth a Pigeon, together with a great Quantity of ‘ Blood. Here is a fair Plump Miracle. A Pigeon coming out of a Man’s Side being a very curious Sight; but now by the Alteration of one single Letter in the Original †, it dwindles into no Miracle at all; and the Passage imports only that there came out of his *Left* Side a great Quantity of Blood, the Greek Word which signifies the *Left*, and that which signifies a Pigeon being near in Sound to one another. If the Mistake of one Letter can make such a Change, what may the Mistake of a Word do? And what may the Corruption of a Piece of a Sentence do? But Mr. *Rhind* is a Writer of Courage who sticks at nothing.

IV. He alledges p. 99 *That such an Interpolation was hardly, if at all, Practicable* But pray why not *Practicable*? For 1st. Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear of the Ignorance or Knavery of Transcribers? Does he not know that the Works of the Fathers were a long Time in the Hands of Monks or others of the like Stamp, who, with all their Religion, were yet so familiar and used such Freedom with the Fathers, as not only to pare their Nails that they might not be scratched by them; But even to alter their Habit and Dress, to fit them to the Modes of their own Times, and make ’em fashionable (*o*)? Even the *Vossian* Greek Manuscript is not judged to be above eleven Hundred Years Old, that is, about 500 Years latter than the Times of *Ignatius*; and how corrupt the Church was about the Six Hundred Year of God needs not be told. 2^{dly}, Is it not a very good Argument that the *Ignatian* Epistles *might* be interpolated, when it is plain beyond Contradiction that they actually *were* interpolated? What Security had Bishop *Usher*’s or *Isaac Vossius*’s Copies against the Possibility of Interpolation, any more than other Copies? Why, saith Mr.

† *Ubi Supra* p. 58. 59.

† *Epistolæ Ignatij*
 13. 28. 17. *Antiph.*

(*o*) *Sherlock’s* Pre. vative against Popery. Part. I. Chap. II. Sect. 3. p. 74.

Mr. Rhind p. 98, ' Considering the great Simplicity of these pious
' Times, it is scarce credible that the greatest Ornaments of the Chri-
' stian Church after the Apostles were wicked enough to be guilty
' of so base a Fraud, or Weak enough to be imposed on by these
' who might be thus Wicked. Is not this a Powerfull Orator, who
will needs harangue People out of Matter of Fact? Let the *Great*
Ornaments of the Church be as far from being either *Wicked* or *Weak*
as Mr. Rhind pleases, yet that some Persons were so *Wicked* as to be
guilty of such a Fraud, and others so *Weak* as to be imposed on
by it, is so far from being incredible, that it is confessed on all
Hands, that not only that, but even Twenty other Things of the
like Nature have been done. And all Mr. Rhind's Reasonings
against the Possibility or Practicableness of interpolating *Ignatius's*
Epistles labour under this one small Absurdity, that if they prove
any Thing, they will prove that no false Writeing could have
been palmed on the Church, nor any Genuine one Corrupted. And
whence then came so many spurious Pieces, such as *Abgarus's* Let-
ter to our Blessed Saviour, and our Saviour's Answer to Him;
which *Eusebius* tells us, with as much Confidence as he does the
Story of the *Ignatian* Epistles, he had faithfully Translated out of
the *Syriack* Language as he found them in the Archives of *Edeffa*?
Whence came St. Paul's Epistle to the *Laodiceans*? Whence came
the Letters that passed 'twixt *Seneca* and Him? Whence came St.
Peter's, St. *Mark's*, St. *Matthew's* and St. *James's* Liturgies, which
Mr. Rhind * makes an Argument of, as being of considerable An-
tiquity, though Dr. Wake (p) twenty Years ago declared, that the
learned World seemed to be universally agreed about the Falsity of
them. Not to speak of many others mentioned by *Hottinger*, *Coke*,
Du pin and Dr. Wake, whence came the *Apostolical Constitutions*,
which Mr. Whiston an Advocate for Episcopacy asserts (q) to be
the most Sacred of the Canonical Books of the New Testament? Is there
any Age can be named upon which more false Pieces were fathered
than the *First* and *Second*? And what Charm then was there in *Ignatius's*
Name, that none should be fathered on him? Or why should

S

we

* Sermon on Liturgy p. 14. [p] Ubi supra First Edit. p. 145. [q] Essay upon the Apostolical Constitutions.

we believe there were not, when the Contrary is Manifest and confessed by all the World? For let us take a short View of 'em.

The *Ignatian Epistles*, saies *Coke* (r), a Church of *England* Divine, were first published at *Strasburg* Anno 1502. And though they are now only *Seven*, yet then they were eleven in Number. In process of Time it seems they begot another among 'em: For when in the Year 1562 they were published in *Greek* and *Latine* at *Paris*, they were found to be *Twelve*. At length as if the Blessing *Be Fruitfull and Multiply* had been pronounced on them, they encreased to the Number of *Fifteen* with a Letter also annexed from the *Virgin Mary* to *Ignatius*. Nor did they alter in Number only, but in Bulk too: For in some Editions some of the Epistles were twice as large as in others. Notwithstanding all this Variety, yet some of the Church of *Rome*, *Canisius* by Name, insulted the World, as our Episcopal Friends do us now, with a great deal of Scorn, because they doubted of any of these Epistles. But the World is never all at once to be bullied out of their Senses. *Mastræus* a *Parisian* Doctor published a new Edition of them, and without Scruple discarded *Four* of them as Apocryphal viz. two to *St. John* the *Evangelist*, one to the *Virgin Mary*, and her Letter to him. Yet even so the remaining *Twelve* did not please learned Men. Archbishop *Usher* has asserted and proves (s) that *Six* of them were spurious, *Six* of them mixed, and so *none* of them sincere and Genuine. *Vedelius* in the Year 1623. published an Edition of the *Ignatian Epistles* at *Geneva*; but he went so near to Work, and castigate them so severely; that the Church of *England* Divines were not pleased with him (t), as indeed they seldom are with any Thing that comes from that Quarter, or almost any other except their own. Hitherto then the *Ignatian Epistles* made but a sorry Figure with all who were not willing to Sacrifice their Sense to their Zeal. At length Archbishop *Usher* fell upon two Copies of them, one in *Cambridge*, another in Bishop *Montague's* Library; yet these were

[r] Censura quorundam Script. Vet. p. 56.

[s] Dissert. de Ep. Ign. p. 108.

[t] Montan. appar. L. 4. Sect. 46. p. 19.

were not Originals but *Latine* Translations and these too very Barbarous. But then to supply this Defect *Isaac Vossius* found in the *Medicean Library* a *Greek Manuscript* of them and published it at *Amsterdam* 1646. Yet, even after all this, the *Latine* Editions are thought to be best by learned Men; and Archbishop *Usher* doubts whether the *Seventh* Epistle viz. that to *Polycarp* be Genuine or not. Nay he was so ill satisfied with it, that he would not publish it with the rest. Nor, saies *Dr. Wake* (v), does *Isaac Vossius* himself deny but that there are some Things in it that may seem to render it suspicious. Besides, the Epistle to the *Romans* was not found in the *Medicean* or *Florentine Manuscript*; but made up, in some Measure, from the *Latine* Versions, by the Conjectures of learned Men, as the same *Dr. Wake* takes Notice (x). And even as to the whole of the Epistles, though the *Doctor* translated from the Text of *Vossius*, yet he owns, that where a Place was manifestly Imperfect he has sometimes taken the Liberty to express his own Conjectures. And now after all let any Man, who can, doubt of the Possibility or Practicableness of these Epistles having been interpolated. But, adds *Mr. Rhind* p. 98, if that should be granted, ‘ I see not how the ‘ *Presbyterians* can Answer the Enemies of our Religion, who complain that the like Freedom may have been used with the Bible ‘ in some fundamental Points much about the same Time. Pray, Good *Mr. Rhind*, were the *Ignatian* Epistles as universally spread as the Bible was? Or was it of as great Importance to keep them uncorrupted as the *Scriptures*? I do not think but either of these Thoughts much more both jointly, besides what else might be added, would answer the Enemies of our Religion. But, to compleat the Answer, does not *Mr. Rhind* know that there were false Gospels obtruded upon the World, obtruded too in *Ignatius’s* own Days? Does he not know that *Ignatius* himself mistook the *Spurious* Gospel for the *True* one? Does he not know that *Mr. Dodwell* Himself has owned that *Ignatius* was thus mistaken. ‘ The Holy Martyr, saith

S 2

‘ he

‘ he (y), did not cautiously enough distinguish ’twixt the Genuine Gospel of S. *Matthew* and the interpolated one which the *Ebionit* Hereticks now raging in *Asia* used. Now if false Gospels could be minted in those Days, could not false *Ignatian* Epistles be so too? If so great an Ornament of the Church as *Ignattus* himself could be imposed on by them, why might not others as great Ornaments be imposed on by false or interpolated Pieces fathered on Him?

V. But Mr. *Rhind* p. 98. ‘ would know of *His* Adversaries, ‘ what these Interpolations are. *He* hopes they will not alledge ‘ that there are any favouring the then or after Heresies; and to ‘ say that these Passages, which assert the Distinction of Ecclesiastical Orders and the *Episcopal* Authority, are of this kind, is a ‘ mean begging of the Question; and so much the meaner still, that ‘ this can be proven from other Monuments of that Age though *Ignatius* had never written an Epistle. For Answer. In the first Place, has he read the Authors on this Controversie with a *Scrupulous Exactness* and knows nothing of what these Interpolations are? Why then I recommend him to *Coke*, *Davie*, *Salmasius*, *Blondel*, *Owen*, the *Jus Divinum Ministerij Evangelici*, *L’arroque*, *Jameison*, *Sculter*, *Rivet*: For why should I repeat what has been so often insisted on? After all that *Hammond*, *Pearson*, *Beveridge*, *Wake* or *Dupin* have advanced in Vindication of these Epistles, I am as well satisfied as I can be of any Thing, that they are either Counterfeit or Corrupted. 2dly, ’Tis true such Interpolations as favoured the then or after Heresies are pretty well weeded out of the *New* Editions: But I have already shewn what Gross Heresies were in the *Old* ones. Now I ask Mr. *Rhind*, how they cou’d creep in when the Genuine Epistles were scattered through *Rome* *Antioch* and several Cities of *Greece*? The Depositories themselves of this sacred Treasure cou’d have confronted these interpolated Pieces with the Genuine Epistles. They themselves cou’d not be the Criminals: And Persons removed at such a Distance could not

[y] *Paronell*. Sect. 23. p. 98. Nempe in *Δοκίμιο* Hæreticos locum protulerat *Ignatius* ex Evangelio S. *Matthæi*, quo negavisse dicebatur Christus se Deum esse incorporatum. Non satis caute distinxit S. Martyr inter S. *Matthæi* Evangelium sincerum, et quale utipabant *Ebionæi* jam in *Asia* grassantes interpolatum. Hic ergo negant Hæretici, et quidem recte, verba illa in Evangelio fuisse quale prodit a S. *Matthæo*.

not have Universally conspired towards such a Deceit: Or if People had been inclined, they wou'd rather have made Bold with the Bible than any inferiour Authority. This is certainly good Reasoning because it is Mr. Rhind's p. 99. And yet how impossible soever it was that such Interpolations *should* creep in; All the World knows and confesses that they *did* creep in. 3dly, Why does Mr. Rhind say that it is a *begging of the Question* to alledge that the Expressions about *Episcopacy* are Interpolations? 'Tis so far from a *begging*, that it is a *proving* of the Point directly. For, when the pretended *Ignatius* extravagantly ascribes that to his Bishops (whether they be supposed *Parochial* or *Diocesan* it alters not the Case) which the Apostles never assumed to themselves, 'tis a plain Evidence that the Author of such Expressions was a Man of no Judgment or Conscience, consequently was not the Holy Martyr *Ignatius*. Is not this the very Reason why the Church of *England* Divines themselves have rejected the *old* Editions of these Epistles, because they are so very immoderate in their Exaltation of the Bishop? For Instance, when in the Epistle to the *Trallians* in the *old* Editions the Bishop is said to be *above all Principality and Power, and more excellent than all as far as it is possible for Man to excell*. And when in the Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, all of what sort soever, not only Presbyters, Deacons and the whole Clergy, but all the People, Souldiers, Princes, *Cesar* Himself are enjoined to perform Obedience to the Bishop. And when in the Epistle to the *Smyrnaans* the Bishop is placed betwixt God and the King, and that by way of Correction of the Words of Scripture *My Son fear God (the Bishop) and the King*. Does not Dr. *Hammond* himself (2) call these *immoderate* Expressions? Does he not pronounce the Doctrine contain'd in them to be *rebellious, extravagant and senseless*? Does he not conclude that they were intert by some *Impostor*? And is there not as good Reason why we should except against the *New* Editions, when there is in them a great deal of such extravagant Stuff yet unpurged out? Can any one read even the *Usserian* and *Vossian* Editions, and not observe such a Turgid, affected, Hyperbolical Stile as wou'd never probably

[2] Aus. to the Animadver. on the Dissert. Chap. III. Sect. 3.

probably have been used by one that had heard and conversed with the Apostles, the Character of whose Writings was Simplicity? Is it possible one of *Ignatius's* Spirit and Character could have made that Boast (a) that he was 'able to know things heavenly, the Orders of Angels, their Constitutions, Principalities, things Visible and Invisible?' 'Tis true Dr. *Hammond* (b) has criticised, and Dr. *Wake* translated that Passage to a contrary Sense; as if He had said *I am not able to know things Heavenly*.....: But both these *Doctors* have done Despite to the Context as well as forced the Words; for the very Paragraph, in which the Passage is, begins thus even according to Dr. *Wake's* Translation in his second Edition. 'Am I not able to write to you of Heavenly things? But I fear lest I should harm you, who are yet but Babes in Christ: (Excuse me *this* Care;) and lest perchance being not able to receive them, ye should be choaked with them. Could so wise and Holy a Man have dropped such unguarded Assertions as these, *Whatsoever the Bishop approves is acceptable to God. My Soul for such as obey the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons.* Is not the very Foundation of Popery, viz. an *Implicit Faith*, wrapt up in these Expressions? 4thly, Why did Mr. *Rhind* say that the Episcopal Authority can be proven from other *Monuments* of that Age? Where are these *Monuments*? Why did he not produce them, or at least name them? Had Mr. *Rhind* considered that things were not to be taken upon his meer Assertion; I'm sure he had found Cause to make his Book at least a hundred Times bigger than it is, or to leave out five hundred things he has put into it. *Polycarp* was the most contemporary Writer with *Ignatius* that can be named. But though he prescribes *Deacons* and *Presbyters* their Duty, yet he does not so much as once name *Bishops*, or any thing equivalent to them above the Degree of *Presbyters*; but plainly supposes that there were then no other Orders in the Church but those of *Priests* and *Deacons*. *Wherefore ye must needs abstain from all these things; being Subject to the Priests and Deacons, as unto God and Christ* (c).

VI. Mr. *Rhind* asks further p. 100. 'Why any such Interpolation

[a] Ep. to the *Trial*; Sect. V. [b] Vind. of the *Dissert.* Chap. III. Sect. 3. [c] Ep. to the *Philip.* Sect. V. VI;

tion should have been attempted. For if the Testimonies in these Epistles that favour the Episcopal Authority are not agreeable to the Faith and Practice of the *Ignatian* Age; then many living about the Time of the Interpolation might have been sensible of this. And as it was next to Impossible to deceive such by *spurious* Epistles so it is highly improbable that they would suffer others to be deceived. To this Purpose He. But this is the very same Thing he has said so often over, and which I have so largely exposed. 'Tis beyond Contradiction, and is confessed on all Hands that there were Interpolations made, and that too in the Matter of Episcopacy, whereof I just now gave Instances. This being clear, where is the Necessity of giving either the *How* or the *Why* of such Interpolations? Let Mr. *Rhind* or any of his Brethren give us the *How* or the *Why*, these extravagant Expressions in the Matter of Episcopacy which I have just now instanced, and which are confessed to be Interpolations, were foisted into the *Ignatian* Epistles; and I here promise to give Him the *How* or *Why* of all the rest which he thinks do make for his Purpose. So much then for Mr. *Rhind's* Vindication of the *Ignatian* Epistles.

To conclude it, He refers his Readers p. 107. if *any of them are not yet fully Satisfied to the Incomparable Dr. Pearson's and the learned Dupin's Performances on that Head*. And I refer my Reader to the Authors whom I have already cited. 'Tis true the greatest Men of the Church of *England* have made their utmost Efforts in behalf of these *Ignatian* Epistles: But 'tis as true they have been taken up by as great Men as themselves. 'Tis true likewise the Church of *England* Divines got the last Word: But it is as true, it was, not because they *won* it, but because they *begg'd* it, and owed their keeping the Field not to the Strength of their *Reasons* but to the earnestness of their *Importunity*, as appears from Monsieur *L' Arroque's* Life prefixed to His *Adversaria Sacra*, from *Walker's* Translation of *L' Arroque's* History of the *Eucharist*, and from the Author of the *Elogium* on Monsieur *L' Arroque* in the *Nouvelles de Republique de Lettres*. They have been told of this before (*d*), but

but it was needfull to tell them over again, because they sometimes affect to be dull of Hearing. But enough of *Ignatius*.

The next Testimony He produces is from *Clemens* Bishop of *Rome*, in his first Epistle to the *CORINTHIANS* Sect. 40. in which the Argumentative Words are. ' For the Chief Priest has His proper Services, and to the Priests their proper Place is appointed; and to the Levites appertain their proper Ministries; and the Lay-Man is confined within the Bounds of what is commanded to Lay-Men. From which He inferrs p. 109. ' that to the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons in the Christian Church such a Distinction of Offices does belong, as formerly obtain'd among the High Priests, and Levites under the Jewish Dispensation; which is further confirmed by the Authority of *St. Ierom* (that pretended Patron of Parity) who saies, *what Aaron and his Sons were, that we know the Bishops and Presbyters are*. Thus *Mr. Rhind*. Now let us examine all this.

In the first Place. Was *Clemens* Bishop of *Rome* when he wrote this Epistle? Hear *Dr. Wake* (e) ' I conclude then, saith He, ' that this Epistle was written shortly after the End of the Persecution under *Nero*: Between the *LXIV* and *LXX* Year of Christ: And that, as the Learned Defender of this Period supposes, in the Vacancy of the See of *Rome*; before the Promotion of *S. Clement* to the Government of it. Thus He. Plainly, this Epistle was written at least forty two Years before Episcopacy was institute, by *Mr. Doanell's* Accompt; and before there was any such thing as a Bishop in the World except *James* Bishop of *Jerusalem* who was in Place of Universal Pope. This, I hope, is more than Sufficient to take off *Clement's* Testimony: For how could he speak of a Thing which was not yet in Being. Yet lest *Mr. Rhind* should complain of Neglect

In the Second Place. I ask, does that Passage, which he has cited from *Clemens*, in the least tend to prove that there were then three Distinct Orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Christian Church? No. He uses it only by way of General Accommodation,

commodation, that the Christians at *Corinth* shou'd be Subject to their Spiritual Guides; as the *Jews*, whose Polity was yet standing, were to theirs. But it never entered into his Thoughts to run a Parallel 'twixt the Officers in the one and the other Polity. And Mr. *Rhind* might as well have proved that the Officers in the Christian Church corresponded to those in the *Roman Army*, because the same *Clement* saies *Sect.* 37. ' Let us consider the Souldiers who obey their Leaders in War, how orderly, readily and with all Subjection they execute their Orders. All are not Pretors or Chiliarchs, nor Centurions nor Commanders of Fifty. Every one performs, in his Order and Station, what is commanded by the King and the Leaders. Plainly, one needs no more to convince Him that Episcopacy did not obtain in that Time, but to read *Clement's* Epistle. The Occasion and Subject of it is this. The People of *Corinth* had raised a Sedition against their Presbyters, and would not be regulated by them. *Clemens* wrote his Epistle on Purpose to compell that Sedition. ' They are shamefull yea very shamefull things beloved, saith he *Sect.* 47, to be heard, that the most firm and Ancient Church of the *Corinthians* should by (or for the Sake of) one or two Persons rise up in Sedition against the Presbyters. Does he ever recommend it to them to referr their Quarrel to the Bishop? Not once. What could be the reason of this? had he been absent, *Clement* might have entreated them to wait his Return. Had he been Dead, he might have desired them to keep Quiet till there were a new one Chosen. Yet *Clemens* advises to neither of these, no not by a Hint. Does he acknowledge any more than two Orders of Officers in the Church *Bishops* and *Deacons*? No. ' The Apostles, saith He *Sect.* 42, preaching through Countries and Cities constituted their first Fruits, having proved them by the Spirit, for *Bishops* and *Deacons* of those that should afterwards believe. No mention of *Presbyters* here. Did he not positively own that these *Bishops* were no other than *Presbyters*? Yes. ' For it would be our no small Sin, saith He *Sect.* 44, should we cast off those from their *Bishoprick* who without Blame and Holily offer the Gifts. Blessed are those *Presbyters* who having finished their Course have obtain'd a fruitfull and perfect Dissolution. To confirm all. *Grotius* in his Epistle to *Bignonius* proves this Epistle of

Clement to be of undoubted Antiquity. ‘ Because, *saith he (f)*, no where therein does he make Mention of that *Paramount* or *Peculiar* Authority of *Bishops*, which, by Ecclesiastical Custom, began after the Death of *Murk* to be introduced at *Alexandria*; and from that Precedent into other places; but He plainly shews, as the Apostle *Paul* had done, that the Churches were governed by the Common Council of the *Presbyters*, who are all called *Bishops* both by Him and *Paul*. Thus *Grotius*. But *Grotius* was a *Dutch-Man*. True. But his Reasoning was right *English*. ‘ They, *saith the Learned Stillingfleet (g)* that can find any one single Bishop at *Corinth* when *Clement* wrote his Epistle to them, must have better Eyes and Judgment than the deservedly admired *Grotius*.

In the Third Place. I ask how *Jerom’s* Words, *What Aaron and his Sons were that we know the Bishops and Presbyters are*, contribute to the clearing or confirming *Clement’s* Testimony. Why did not Mr. *Rhind* tell where *Jerom* has these Words? ’Twas too much Niceness in him to think that citing Authors in such a Case as this would be reckoned *Pedantry*: The industrious avoiding of it rather deserves that Name. But the Reason is Evident, Mr. *Rhind* knew very well, that if any one would look the Place, He would see how absurdly it were alledged. Plainly the words are taken out of *Jerom’s* famous Epistle to *Evagrius*, the Occasion and Contents of which are these. A certain Deacon of the Church of Rome had started a pretty odd Opinion viz. that *Deacons* were *superiour* to *Presbyters*. For chastising the Arrogance of that Spark, *Jerom* wrote the said Epistle. ‘ A Fool, *saith he (h)* will speak foolish Things, I hear there is one who has broke out into such a Height of Folly as to ‘ *preferr* *Deacons* to *Presbyters*; that is, to *Bishops*. Then He proceeds to confute Him by Arguments. And the great Argument upon which he goes is this. *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were in the Apostles

[f] Quod nusquam meminit exortis illius Episcoporum auctoritatis, quæ Ecclesiæ Consuetudine, post *Marci* mortem, *Alexandria*, atque eo exemplo, alibi introduci cepit; sed plane ut *Paulus* Apostolus ostendit, Ecclesiæ Communis Presbyterorum, qui idem omnes et Episcopi ipsi Pauloque dicuntur, consilio fuisse gubernatis. [g] *Ironic p. 182.*

[h] Legimus in *Eccl. i.* Fatuus satius loquitur. Audio quendam in tantam Erupisse vecordiam. Ut Discipulos Presbyteris, id est, Episcopis anteferreret. Nam cum Apostolus perspicue eisdem esse Presbyteros quos Episcopos, quid paucis Menstrum & Viduarum Minister, ut supra eos se tumidus esset. Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui ceteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est. Nam et *Alexandria* a *Marco* Evangelista usque ad *Heracium* & *Dionysium* Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se Electum in Excelseri gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant. Quid enim facit, excepta Orantibus, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat.

postles Time all one. But it were a palpable Folly to preferr Deacons to Bishops. *Ergo* it is the same Folly to preferr Deacons to Presbyters. The first of these Propositions *viz.* that Bishops and Presbyters were in the Apostles Time all one, He proves from the very same Scriptures which the Presbyterians have ever insisted on. And tho' Episcopacy was so far advanced in his Time, which had been set on Foot after the Apostles Days *for a Remedy of Schism*; yet even then he declares, *That excepting Ordination the Bishop does nothing which the Presbyter might not do.* Is it then Imaginable that after all this, *Jerom* in that very same Epistle should allow Bishops to be Superiour to Presbyters by Divine Right, as the High Priest under the Law was to the ordinary Priests? No. 'Tis plain that the Comparison runs, not between *Aaron* and his Sons under the Law, and Bishops and Presbyters under the Gospel; but between *Aaron* and his Sons as one Part of the Comparison under the Law, and the *Levites* under them as the other. So under the Gospel Bishops and Presbyters make one Part of the Comparison, answering to *Aaron* and His Sons in that wherein they all agree *viz.* the Order of Priesthood, and the other Part under the Gospel is that of *Deacons* answering to the *Levites* under the Law. And this Gloss upon *Jeroms* Words, as the Context necessarily requires, so the learned *Stillingfleet* (i) has expressly confirmed. And besides, Dr. *Hammond*, as we have before observed, by denying the middle Order of *Presbyters* in the Apostles Days, has quite destroyed the Argument from the *Jewish* Priesthood. Was not then Mr. *Rhind* very well advised, when he would press *Jerom* into his Service in the very Face of his own Protestation to the Contrary; and that too for confirming *Clement's* Testimony who never dropt so much as one Syllable in favours of a Bishop above a Presbyter. So much for *Clemens*, and I don't think but the Reader is by this Time convinced, that Mr. *Rhind* could have been at no loss though he had never mentioned Him.

His Third Testimony is from a Letter of the Emperour *Adrian* to *Servianus*, but, supposing it were for his purpose, 'tis so very shameful a one, that for the Honour of the Episcopal Order it ought to have been buried in Silence. But Dr. *Monro* (k) had touch'd

The Emperour
ADRIAN

T 2

upon

upon it, and therefore Mr. Rhind thought it necessary he should do so too. The Words of the Letter insited on by Mr. Rhind p. 109 are. *There are Christians who Worship Serapis, and they are devoted to Serapis who call themselves the Bishops of Christ. There no Ruler of the Synagogue, no Christian Presbyter, who does not, &c.* From this he inferrs, ' That when *Adrian* was in *Egypt Anno Christ. 131.* ' the Distinction of Bishops and Presbyters was so notorious, that ' the Emperour supposeth it as an undoubted Truth. But the very contrary is evident from the Emperour's Words. And 'tis clear as Light that these whom he calls *Bishops* in the first Clause are the same with those he calls *Presbyters* in the next: A way of Speaking which every Body knows to be according to the constant Stile of the Scripture, and consequently of all such as knew any Thing of the Christian Affairs. I have set down † the Emperour's Words as He wrote them, that the Reader may see this the more evidently.

His Fourth Testimony p. 110. is from *Irenæus Lib. 3. Cap. 3. contra Heres.* who saies, *We can reckon them, who IRENÆUS were appointed Bishops by the Apostles in the Churches, and their Successors to our Day: To whom also they committed these Churches, delivering to them the same Dignity of Power.* 'Tis answered.

First, Supposing *Irenæus* were against us, yet his Judgment about Traditions is of no great Weight. For, in that same Chapter which Mr. Rhind has cited, He asserts (l) not only the Preeminence of the Church of *Rome*, but the necessary Dependence of all other Churches upon Her. And elsewhere (m) he asserts Christ to have been past the *Fortieth* and near the *Fiftieth* Year of his Age, when he suffered: And that the Elders who were with *John* in *Asia* testified, that they had that by Tradition from *John* himself, yea that the Gospel it self Teaches

† *Adrianus* Aug. *Serviano* Con. S. *Ægyptum* quem mihi laudabas, *Serviane* Clarissime, totam didisti. Ierem, pseudulan, &c. ad omnia famæ momenta volitantem. Illi qui *Serapim* colunt Christiani sunt, &c. deo etiam *Serapi*. Qui se Christi *Episcopos* dicunt. Nemo illic *Archisynagogus* Judæorum, nemo *Samaritanus*, nemo Christianorum *Presbyter*, non *Mathematicus* &c.

[l] Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter Potentiorum Principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.

[m] *Lib. 2. Cap. 30. 29.* A quadragesimo aut quinquagesimo Anno decimarum præteritatem teniorem, quam habens Dominus noster docebat, sicut Evangelium & omnes Seniores testantur quia illa apud *Joannem* Discipulum Domini convenerunt, ad ipsum tradidisse eis *Joannem*-- Quinquagesima autem annuum nondum attingit, non tamen multum a quinquagesimo Anno abilit.

Teaches it, and he is very angry with those who think otherwise. When he stumbled so prodigiously in so plain a Case; Pray what Credit is to be given to his Traditions about the Succession of Bishops, which is generally acknowledged by the Episcopalians themselves to be a most perplexed and uncertain Piece of History.

Secondly, Does *Irenæus* say, as Mr. *Rhind* has Translated him, that the Apostles delivered to the Bishops the same Dignity of Power? No, his Words ⁽ⁿ⁾ *Whom also (viz. the Bishops) they left their Successors, delivering to them their own Place of Mastership.* That is, the Apostles constitute them the Supream Officers in the Church, so that they were to have none above them any more than the Apostles had. But, that they delivered either to Bishop or Presbyter the same Dignity of Power, *Irenæus* never said. But

Thirdly, There is no need either of Declining *Irenæus's* Testimony, or refining upon his Words. Mr. *Rhind* tells he cou'd improve upon his Testimony: And I cannot but wish he had made all the Improvement of it he could. For that the Apostles appointed Bishops in the Churches, every Presbyterian owns. But that he appointed Prelats or Diocesan Bishops, no Episcopalian has yet proved. If they will still go on to expose themselves by insisting upon the Word Bishop no Body can help it. Presbyterians must take Care they be not imposed upon by meer Sounds. 'Tis certain that *Irenæus* took Bishop and Presbyter for one and the same Officer. 'Wherefore, saith *he* (o), it behoves us to hearken to those who are Presbyters in the Church, to those who, as we have shewn, have their Succession from the Apostles; who, together with the Succession of the Episcopate, have also received the certain Gift of the Truth according to the Pleasure of the Father. Thus *Irenæus*. And what strange Confusion, saies Stillingfleet (p), must this raise in any one's Mind that seeks for a Succession of Episcopal Power over Presbyters from the Apostles by the Testimony of *Irenæus*, when he so plainly attributes both the Succession to Presbyters, and the Episcopacy too which he speaks of. So much for *Irenæus*.

His

[n] Quos et successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum id est unum Magistrum tradentes.

[o] Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteris obaure oportet. His qui Successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus, qui cum Episcopatus Successione, Charisma veritatis certum, secundum placitum Patris acceperunt.

[p] *Irenæus*. p. 307.

His Last Testimony, p. 110, is from *Tertullian*, who, saith He, *began to flourish at the same Time with Irenæus*,
TERTULLIAN. *that is, in the Declension of the Second Century, and saies Lib. de Baptismo, ' The High Priest, who is the Bishop, has the Right of giving Baptism, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the Bishop's Authority. For Answer.*

In the *First Place*. I should be Glad to know where Mr. *Rhind* came by this Piece of *Chronology*. 'Tis true *Tertullian* began to flourish in the Declension of the Second Century, *viz.* after the Year 192: And wrote his Book *de Baptismo*, from which Mr. *Rhind* cites about the Year 201 (q). But *Irenæus's* Flourishing was well nigh blown off e're that Time: For he died, saies Mr. *Dodwell* (r) before the Persecution under *Severus* which began in the Year 202 or 203. 'Tis then something Hard to conceive, how *Tertullian began to flourish at the same Time with Irenæus*. But passing this

In the *Second Place*. I ask What would Mr. *Rhind* infer from *Tertullian's* Testimony? Is it that there were *three* distinct Orders of Ecclesiastical Officers, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Beginning of the *third Century*? Every Presbyterian owns it. Is it that the Bishops had this Paramount Power of Baptizing, beyond the Presbyters and Deacons, by *Divine Right*? *Tertullian* Himself denies it, and that in the very next Words to those cited by Mr. *Rhind*. ' It remains, saith He (s), for concluding this little Matter, to advise also concerning the Observation of giving and receiving Baptism. Of *Giving* indeed the High Priest who is the Bishop has the Right, then the Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the Authority of the Bishop FOR THE HONOUR OF THE CHURCH, which being Safe, Peace is Safe. Otherwise EVEN LAY-MEN HAVE THE RIGHT: For what is equally received, may be equally given. Thus *Tertullian*. Say now

[q] Spanheim Hist. Eccles. p. 719. [r] Dissert. 3. in Iren.

[s] Superest, ad concludendam materiam, de observatione quoque Dandi & accipiendi baptismi communis tractare. Dandi quidem habet jus summus Sacerdos, qui & Episcopus: Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesie honorem, quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam Laici jus est. Quod enim ex aquo accipitur, ex aquo dari potest.

now, Good Reader, if Mr. *Rhind* was not either very *ill* furnished of Testimonies, or very *well* with Assurance, when he insisted on this.

And thus now I have gone through His *Antiquity*, and hope 'tis plain that when he was a entering on it, he might have spared his Harangue wherein he would perswade the Presbyterians to appeal to the Fathers: For I can hardly believe he has gained much by referring to these Judges. And if his own Conscience was satisfied with these Testimonies he has produced, I must needs say it is no Ill-Natured one.

ARTICLE VI.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument for Prelacy from the Impossibility of its obtaining so Early and Universally if it had not been of Divine Institution, is Examined, From P. III. to P. 119.

THERE can be nothing more Ridiculous than to dispute against the Possibility of a Matter of Fact. If I had seen Mr. *Rhind* some Time at *Edinburgh*; and, within a Short while after, had heard from unexceptionable Witnesses that he was at a Hunder Miles Distance from it, must I believe notwithstanding that he never changed Places; because I am not able to tell *How* or *When* he did it, nor perhaps answer all the Objections one might puzzle me with against either the Physical or Moral Impossibility of his having done so. Because Mr. *Rhind* was educated Presbyterian, was a Zealot in that Way, and profited (more Ways than

than one) above many of his Equals; must I therefore deny that he is now Episcopalian, and of the new Cut too; because neither I, nor indeed any Body else, can account for his Change. Has he not heard Mr. *Dodwell* so often affirming, that the Government was changed about the Year CVI; changed too, not only without any Account of it, but without any Warrant for it contain'd in the Scriptures? Why then will he dispute against the Possibility of a Change? But 'twas his Pleasure, as it has been of many of his Brethren Writers to do so; and we must attend Him in His Performance.

That a Change, of the Government of the Church by a Parity of Pastors, into a Government by Prelacy, had been morally Impossible, he argues I. From the Piety and Zeal of the Primitive Times. II. From the Universal spread of Episcopacy. III. From the Vigilance of the Governours of the Church. IV. From the Unparallel'dness of the Case. V. From the No-Opposition made to the Change, and the Want of any Insinuation that ever the Church was governed according to the Presbyterian Model. Of these in Order.

I. He argues p. 111. 112. from the Piety and Zeal of the Primitive Times. ' If the Presbyterian had been the Divine Form of Government, it could never once have entered into the Thoughts of Men who had shared in or been Subject to this Government, to attempt or allow its Change. Would these Primitive Persons who were Bishops in the first Ages, have usurped an Antiscriptural Authority. What could have tempted them to it? Not the Love of Riches, they forsook all for the Sake of Christ. Not Ambition; for they knew their Promotion render'd them the more Obnoxious to the Fury of their Persecutors. Supposing they had been act'd either by Worldliness or Ambition, yet would the Presbyters and Deacons have suffered such an Encroachment to be made upon their Divine Right? Or would the People have submitted to such an Usurpation? To this Purpose he. For Answer. It cannot be denyed, that the Zeal and Piety of the Primitive Times was much greater than of ours: But why would he impose upon People by a *Chimerical* Representation of these Times, contrary to the Faith of all History? Men still were, and always will be Men; that is, very Corrupt, how Holy soever the Religion

Religion is which they profess. And *Church-Men* are Men too; and, even in the Primitive Times, gave many and very Scandalous Examples, and were the greatest Cause of the Corruption of Christians, and sometimes of their Persecution too. What a tragical Complaint does *Eusebius* (t) make of the Wickedness of *Christians* in general, and of *Church-Men* in particular? ‘ Bishops, saith He, ‘ rushed (like mad Beasts) against Bishops. Most detestable Hypocrisy and Dissimulation advanced even to the very Height of Wickedness. We were not touched with any Sense of the Divine Judgment creeping in upon us, used no Endeavours to regain his Favour; but wickedly thinking that God neither did regard nor would visit our Crimes, we heaped one Wickedness upon another. And those who seemed to be our Pastors, rejecting the Rule of Piety, were enflamed with mutual Contentions against one another; and while they were only taken up with Contentions, Threatnings, Emulation, Mutual Hatred and Enmity, and every one eagerly pursued his Ambition in a Tyrannical Manner, then the Lord covered the Daughter of Zion with a Cloud in His Anger, and remembered not His Footstool in the Day of His Anger, but raised up the *Dioclesian* Persecution against them. Thus *Eusebius* and a great deal more to this Purpose. Fifty Years before that, *Cyprian* (v) complain’d of an Universal Depravation in the Clergy as well as the Laity. ‘ That the Priests had no Devotion, the Ministers or Deacons no Fidelity, That there was no Charity in Works, no Discipline in Manners. And does not *Jerom* * tell us, that ‘ the Primitive Churches were tainted with ‘ many gross Errors whilst the Apostles were alive, and the Blood ‘ of Christ yet warm in Judea? But why do I insist on Human Testimony? Does not the Apostle *Paul* himself make the like Complaint. *Phil.* 3. 18. MANY walk, of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the Enemies of the Cross of Christ; whose God is their Belly, who mind Earthly Things. And *Chap.* 2. 21. ALL seek their own, not the Things which are Jesus Christ’s. Even in those

U

early

[t] Hist. Eccles. Lib. VIII. Cap. I.

[v] Non in Sacerdotibus Religio devota, non in Ministris fides integra, non in operibus Misericordia, non in Moribus Disciplina &c. *Cyprian* De Lapsis.

* Adversus Luciferian.

early Times, and while the Church was under Persecution, a *Diotrephes* could aspire to the *Preeminence* 3 *John* 9. And even the *Peoples* Liberality made so considerable a Provision for the Maintenance of Church-Men, that the Apostles found Cause, oftner than once, to Caution them against Undertaking the Office for *filthy Lucre's* Sake 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. 1 *Tim.* 3. 3. Where then was the Impossibility of a Change even upon the Principles of Ambition and Covetousness? Might not one at Mr. *Rhind's* rate of Reasoning prove, that it was not possible there should have been any such Officers as *Sub-Deacons*? The Deacons (Good Men) would not be so Ambitious as to seek to have Underlings. There could be none so mean Spirited as to submit to be such. Suppose both these, the *People* (of whose Charity the Deacons were the Trustees) would not have suffered it. Yet *Cyprian* (x) makes Mention of them as undisputed Officers in his Time; though 'tis certain there was no Divine Institution for them, any more than for *Acolyths* and *Exorcists* whom he also speaks of. Again, 'tis certain all Bishops were Originally equal, how is it possible then that ever there could arise *Arch-Bishops* or *Metropolitans*? Would any of the Bishops have usurped the Honour? Wou'd their fellow Bishops have submitted to the Encroachment? Would the People have suffered it? Yet, how Impossible soever it was that they *should* be; Mr. *Rhind* himself I hope will not deny that they *were*; yea and that they were brought in so early and with so little Noise that some Learned Men have thought they were from the Beginning. We see then how Insufficient Mr. *Rhind's* first Argument is.

II. He argues p. 112. from the Universal Spread of Episcopacy: Though such a Change might have happened in a Corner; yet, if Prelacy had not been of Divine Institution, how could it have obtained Universally? Which yet it did: 'For, saith he p. 117, 'it was fully established over all the Earth, without any Opposition or Noise a Dozen of Years or so after the sealing of the Sacred Canon. 'Tis answered. This is a very Insufficient Argument. 'Episcopacy spread it self through the whole Earth. Why so did *Arrianism*. 'The whole World, saies Jerom (y), groaned and

‘ and wondered to see it self turned *Arrian*. Besides, ’tis false that Prelacy prevailed Univerſally. Many Inſtances might be given to the contrary; but not to wander from Home: Though Chriſtianity was planted here in *Scotland* in the Days of the Apoſtles, and got the Legal Eſtabliſhment in the Beginning of the *third Century*; yet we had no ſuch Thing as Prelacy till near the midle of the fifth that *Palladius* brought it hither from *Rome*; as *Bede*, *Fordun*, *John Major*, *Hector Boethius*, *Buchanan* and *Craig* with others do teſtifie.

III. He argues from the Vigilance of the Governours of the Church. ‘ For, ſaith he p. 115. if Errours in Doctrines, which may ‘ more eaſily paſs without Notice, did not eſcape their Obſervation ‘ and Censure; how can it be ſuppoſed that they wou’d not have ‘ obſerved and condemned any Inroachments made upon the Con- ‘ ſtitution of their Society? But who ſees not how falſe this way of arguing is? Whence came all the Uſurpations and Corruptions both in Principle and Practice which began to take Place from the earlieſt Ages of Chriſtianity? Does not every Body know, that at leaſt a great many of them crept in Inſenſibly; and that the Tares were ſown while Men Slept? ‘ No, ſaies Mr. Rhind p. 117. theſe ‘ did not obtain till after ſome Centuries. They were remonſtrated ‘ againſt by many. They were never allowed by one half of the Church. This, I muſt needs ſay, is confident enough talking. I ſhall give one Inſtance for Mr. Rhind to try his Skill on: It is the giving of the Eucharift to Infants. It obtained *early*. *Cyprian* (z) ſpeaks of it, not as a new thing, but as an Ordinary Practice. It obtained *univerſally*: *Auguſtin* (a) calls it Apoſtolicall Tradition. No Wonder; for it was pretended to be founded on that Text of Scripture *John* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the Fleſh* &c, and he is ſo briſk on that Head, that he affirms ‘ that none who minds He ‘ is a Chriſtian of the Catholick Church denyſ that Expoſition or ‘ doubts of its Truth. It prevailed ſo long, that the Famous *Benigne Boſſuet* Biſhop of *Meaux* (b) brings it down to the *Twelfth Century*;

U 2

and

[z] Serm. de Lapis, Sect. 20. [a] Vide Ep. 106. Lib. 1. contra Julianum. Lib. 1. De Peccat-merit. & Remissione contra Pelagianum.

[b] Traite de la Communion ſous Les Deux Eſpeces. p. 81. &c.

and affirms it to be used at this Day in the *Greek Church*. 'Tis plain that the Practice was unaccountable, and the Principle on which it was built false. But can Mr. *Rhind* name the Person that remonstrated against the Introducing it? Can he name any Church that refused it? Can he tell the Century in which it began? No, nothing of all this is possible. Where is now the Vigilance of the Church Governours? If it could not secure in one Thing, how shall it do in another?

IV. He argues, p. 116, from the Unparallel'dness of the Case, ' That the like never happened in the Government of any other Society, whether of former or latter Times. For Instance, the Establishment of the consular Dignity upon the Expulsion of their Kings by the *Romans*, and the Change of the Republican into a Monarchical Form occasioned a vast Expence of Treasure and Blood. And in the Days of our K. *Charles I* the Monarchy was not destroyed nor the Common-Wealth established till after a considerable Resistance. From all which he inferrs, *that such an insensible Change in the Government of the Church ought not to be supposed*. This reasoning is built upon Grounds so notoriously false, that it scarce deserves the Name of a poor Piece of Sophistry. For it is contrary to all History and Experience, which shews us there have been great Changes, the Authors and the Beginnings and Opposers of which cannot now be known: Tho' no Man can doubt there hath been an Alteration made. For the Body Spiritual and Civil too, is like the Body Natural; in which as there are some Diseases which make such a violent and sudden Assault that one may say, at what Moment they began; so there are other, which grow so insensibly and by such slow Degrees, that none can tell when the First Alteration was made, and by what Accident from a good habit of Body to a Bad. 'Tis true, the instanced Changes both in the *Roman* and *English* Government occasion'd a vast Expence of Blood and Treasure. But within the Memory of Man the *Portuguese* in the Year 1640 shook off the *Castilian* Yoke and set up the Duke of *Braganza* for their King: And yet, so far as I can learn, there was neither a Earthing Treasure spent, nor a Drop of Blood spilt in

the

the Quarrel. Because the Protestants cannot (which *Bellarmin* (c) challenges them to do) in all Cases give an Account of the Author of the Change, the Time when it began, the Place where, who opposed it and so on; must we therefore believe that the Church of *Rome* hath made no Change at all as to her Doctrines and Practices which Christ and his Apostles settled? Who can give us the History of the *Communion in one Kind*? It grew by Degrees to be a general Custom; but no Body I suppose can tell where or when it began? Who is able to trace the Beginnings of the lying Oracles among the Pagans? But must we therefore ascribe them to God? According to Mr. *Rhind*'s Way of Reasoning, the *Traditionary* Law of the *Jews* must pass for true, and that it came from Mount *Sinai* by Word of Mouth, as the *Written* Law did: For none can shew its Original, much less name the Authors of the severall Traditions, and who opposed them, as Dr. *Symon Patrick* late Bishop of *Ely* has observed (d), and from whom I have taken the Substance of all this Answer, that the Episcopal Party may see how their Reasonings against the Church of *Rome* quite destroy their Reasonings against the *Presbyterians*. Nay are indeed the very Reverse of them. This might be Sufficient to take off his next Argument, yet *ex Superabundanti* I shall consider it particularly. I should, according to the Order of his Book, have inserted it before; but for a Reason which will just now appear, I have delayed it till the Last.

V. He argues from the No-Opposition made to the Change, and the want of any Insinuation that ever the Church was governed according to the Presbyterian Model. Thus. ' When Antichristian Prelacy is supposed to be universally established upon the Ruins of *Jure Divino* Presbytry; there is no considerable Body of Dissenters, not one Presbytry, nor a single Presbyter or Deacon, nor so much as one Contemporary Christian testifying against the one, or declareing for the other, or *once insinuating* that ever the Church was governed according to the Presbyterian Model. Nor did any in the *succeeding* Centuries pretend it did obtain, except Aeri-

and

[c] Lib. 4. Cap. 5. De Notis Ecclesie.

[d] On *Bellarmin*'s second Note of the Church.

and St. Jerom in the Fourth. The one an infamous Heretick; witness *Epiphanius* Heres. 75. So that his Testimony can be of no great Advantage to any Cause, and *Jerom's* as little Serviceable on many Accounts. Thus he p. 113, 114. For Answer.

First, Does not Mr. *Rhind* know how insufficient a Negative Argument in this Case is? Does he not know how few Monuments we have of these Times? Or has he himself recovered them? Does he not know how ill furnished even *Eusebius* himself was with Documents when he wrote his History, & what broken Scrapes he went on? 'Tis no Wonder we cannot give a distinct Account of the Rise and first Steps of Episcopacy: For, from the Death of the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul* in the End of *Nero's* Reign about the Year 68 for the space of 28 Years, that is, till the Year 96; we have either no History to give us Light; or what is worse than none, a parcel of fabulous Legendary Stories. The learned Jesuit *Petavius* (e) speaking of that Period delivers himself thus. 'The Christian Affairs of this Period stand in a faint Light rather through Scarcity of Writers than Matter. For it is not Credible, but that the Apostles and Disciples of Christ in all the World acted Things both great & worthy to be known. But they are generally blended with Fables and uncertain Narrations. And 'tis very observable, and I desire the Reader to remark it; that, at the very Time wherein by Mr. *Dodwell's* Account Episcopacy was set up, that is about the Year CVI or somewhat sooner, the Christians are represented as faint and languishing in their Profession and enclined to Apostatize. The Author of the younger *Pliny's* Life prefixed to his Epistles (f) observes p. 33. that he wrote his Letter to *Trajan* concerning the Christians betwixt the Moneth of September CIII and Spring Time in the Year CV. Now in that Letter he gives a most lamentable Account of the Christians. For, though, as he there relates, Christianity had spread it self through Cities, Villages and Country, yet he was of the Mind that a stop might be put to it. And as Evidence of this he tells the Emperour that the Temples

of

[e] Christianæ res illius Temporis hæud magna in Luce versantur, Scriptorum magis Inopia, quam quæ mandari quod posset Literis extaret nihil. Nam neque parva, neque scitu indigna credibile est Apostolos, ac Christi Discipulos toto Orbe gessisse. Sed pleraque fabulis & incertis Narrationibus aspersa sunt. *Petavius* Ratton. Temp. par. 10, Tem. post. Lib. 5. Cap. 5.

(f) Edit. Oxon. 1703.

of the Heathen Gods which were formerly almost desolate now began to be frequented, and that Sacrifices, hitherto neglected, were coming from all Hands; and that the Return of the Christians to *Paganism* might be yet greater, if they were pardoned for what was past (g). 2dly, Is there any improbability in conceiving, that Testimonies given against a Government which afterward obtain'd universally might be neglected and lost, perhaps industriously smothered and destroyed. 'Tis certain that there were Passages soisted into Books, in Favours of Episcopacy, as we have already proved in the Case of the *Ignatian* Epistles, and as is confessed, as to the old Editions of them, even by the Episcopalsians themselves. And these that could find in their Heart to soist in Passages for themselves, would make no Bones of razing out such as might be against them. 3dly, What though we had not the Contemporaries who testified against the Change, or at least insinuate that Parity of Pastors did at first obtain; may not those that lived shortly after do as well, especially when it was against their Interest to give any such Testimony? But indeed we need not run to this. The *Fathers* of all Ages (so far as their Testimony is worth the Regarding) have given as ample Testimony in favours of Presbytry as Heart could wish; whereof it will not be amiss to give some Instances.

Testimonies for Presbytry from Antiquity:

THE Epistle of *Clemens* to the *Corinthians* is the Earliest, and perhaps the purest Piece of Antiquity extant. We have already heard *Grotius* observing, *CLEMENS* and *Stillingfleet* justifying him in his Observe, *ROMANUS*. that it is written on the *Presbyterian* Scheme. And Ann. Chr. 66. I need not add to what I have already advanced,

to

[g] Neque enim Civitates tantum, sed Vicos etiam atque Agros Superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est, quæ videatur sibi et Corrigi posse. Certe satis Constat, prope jam desolata templa capite celebrari, & sacra Solennia diu intermissa repeti: passimque venire victimas, quarum adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur. Ex quo facile est opinari, quæ turba Hominum omentari possit, si sit Penitentiae Locus. Pius. Lib. 20. Ep. 97.

to shew that Father to be on our Side. Only 'tis no unpleasant Diversion to behold the Episcopal Scuffle about him. By Mr. *Dodwell's* Calculation there was no Bishop (in the Episcopal Sense) in the World at the Time of the Writing of that Epistle, save *James* sitting Pope at *Jerusalem*: All were Presbyters. No wonder then that *Clemens* was silent of Bishops above Presbyters. No, saith Dr. *Hammond* (*h*), *Clement's* Presbyters were all Bishops, there was no middle Order of Presbyters at that Time. Nay, saith Dr. *Burnet* (*i*) now Bishop of *Sarum*, you are both wrong, *Clemens* makes Mention both of Bishops and Presbyters. But pray where? For in all that Epistle there are but two Orders of Ecclesiasticks spoken of viz. Bishops and Deacons: That's nothing, *Clemens*, saith he, by *Deacons* means Presbyters. I'm sure, how ever Decent it may be, yet 'tis pretty Difficult for one to be Witness to this Skirmish and keep His Gravity.

Ignatius, who wrote his Epistles, as Dr. *Wake* testifies (*k*), *An. 116* is the first who distinguishes betwixt Bishop and Presbyter. And he, as I have shewn quite *IGNATIUS* *shop* and *Presbyter*. And he, as I have shewn quite *Ann. Chr. 116.* destroys the Modern Episcopacy. And, that the *Ignatian* Presbyters were employed either in Preaching, Baptizing or giving the Eucharist I have shewn to be meer Supposition which there is not one Title in the Epistles themselves to support. Dr. *Hammond* (*l*) mocks *Salmasius* mightily for saying, ' that the *Ignatian* Epistles were written when Episcopacy, ' properly so called came into the Church, because in all his *Epistles* ' he speaks highly in Honour of *Presbytry* as well as of *Episcopacy*, that ' so the People, that had been accustomed to the *Presbyterian* Govern- ' ment, might the more willingly and easily receive this NEW ' Government by *Episcopacy*, and not be offended at the NOVEL- ' TY of it. And yet I have already produced Mr. *Dodwell* saying the very same thing on the Matter.

Polycarp who wrote his Epistle to the *Philippians* immediately after

[*h*] Vind. of the Dissert. Chap. III. Sect. I. [*i*] Hist. of the Rights of Princes p. 6. [*k*] *Ubi* Supra II. Edit. p. 50. [*l*] *Ubi* Supra Chap. III. Sect. 4.

after *Ignatius*, as *Dr. Wake* (*m*) would have us believe; though he had the fairest Occasion for it, *POLYCARP* yet, as I observed before, makes not the least Ann. Chr. 117. Mention of two Orders of *Pastors*, but of *Priests* and *Deacons* only. And *Dr. Hammond* (*n*) Himself can find no other Way to shift the Force of this, but by turning these *Priests* or *Presbyters* into *Bishops*, and is content to drop the *Presbyters* to save the *Bishops*, who yet, without *Presbyters* to back them, can make but a very *Whiggish* Figure.

Justin Martyr in his *Apology* for the Christians relates that in Every of their Assemblies there was one, whom he calls *President*, who Preached, Prayed, consecrated the Eucharistical Elements, *JUSTIN MARTYR* Ann. Chr. 150. which by the *Deacons* were distributed to those that were present, and sent to those that were Absent (*o*). But that this *President*, whereof there was one in each Christian Assembly, was under the Jurisdiction of another Superior to himself; or that he had any others, except the *Deacons*, Inferiour to Himself; *Justin* gives not so much as the least hint from the one end of his Works to the other.

Irenæus, as we have heard the Learned *Stillingfleet* already confessing, Attributes both the Apostolick Succession and the Episcopate to the *Presbyters*; and most *IRENÆUS* expressly makes them both one Order (*p*). 'It Ann. Chr. 180. 'is Necessary, saith he, to withdraw from all 'such wicked *Presbyters*, but to cleave to such who, as we have 'said before, both keep the Doctrine of the Apostles, and Sound 'Speech with their *Presbyterial* Order, and also shew an Inoffensive 'Conversation to the Information and Correction of the rest.----- 'Such *Presbyters* does the Church bring up, concerning whom 'the Prophet also saies, *I will give thy Princes in Peace, and thy Bishops in Righteousness*. And concerning whom the Lord said, 'Who is that Faithfull and Wise Steward whom the Master sets over His Household. 'Tis plain then that *Irenæus* makes his *Presbyters* *Bishops*, and *Bishops* and *Presbyters* to be one and the same Order; X and

: [*m*] Ubi Supra p. 20. [*n*] Ubi Supra Chap III. Sect. 2. [*o*] Apoll. II. Edit. Græc. Lat. Colon. 1686. p. 97. [*p*] Lib. IV. cap. 44.

* and, by necessary Consequence, Presbyters must needs have all the same Powers with Bishops; which is the main thing contend- ed for. In a Word, though *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were distinguished in *Irenæus's* Days, yet in all his Writings he has not given so much as the least Hint that that Distinction was of *Divine Right*: But on the contrary still insinuates, that They are one and the same Officer in Point of *Order*.

Tertullian, as I have observed before, founds the Distinction 'twixt Bishop and Presbyter not upon *Divine Right*,

TERTULLIAN but the *Honour* and *Order* of the Church; and
Ann. Chr. 203. represents the Presbyters as *presiding* in the Eccle- siastical Courts for the Exercise of Discipline.

* Judgment is passed, *saith he* (q), with great Weight as by
* those who are perswaded that God is Eyeing them; and it is
* the greatest Fore-Token of the Future Judgment, if any one have
* so offended, as to be excluded from Communion in Prayer and of
* the Assembly and of all Religious Commerce. Certain approved
* Elders *preside* who have obtain'd that Honour not by Price, but
* by Testimony. Thus he.

Clemens Alexandrinus is manifestly on our Side. * Those Offices,

* *saith he* (r), are an Imitation of the An-
CLEMENS * gelick Glory, and of that Dispensation,
ALEXANDRINUS * which, as the Scriptures say, *they* wait for,
Ann. Chr. 204. * who trading in the Steps of the Apostles,

* live in the Perfection of Evangelick
* Righteousness; for these the Apostle Writes, shall be taken up into the
* Clouds, and there first as *Deacons* attend, and then according to
* the Process, or next Station of Glory, be admitted into the *Pres- bytry*; for Glory differs from Glory, till they increase to a per- fect Man. Which Passage, as *Sir Peter King* has most judiciously observed (s), proves, that in the Judgment of this *Father* there were but two Ecclesiastical Orders: The *Inferior*, that of *Dea- sons*, who never sat at the Ecclesiastical Conventions, but like Ser- vants stood; as the Saints, when caught up in the Clouds at the last Day,

Day, shall *stand* and wait on Christ's Judgment Seat. The *Superiour*, that of *Presbyters*, design'd also by the Name of *Bishops*; who, in the Ecclesiastical Consistories, always *sat* on Thrones or Seats; just as the Saints when the Judgment is over shall be relieved from *standing* or waiting, and have their Glory perfected, in being placed on the Celestial *Thrones* of that Sublime *Presbytry*, where they shall be forever Blessed and Happy. In a Word, as there are but two *Processes* of the Saint's Glorification *viz.* *standing* before the Judgment Seat, and being *seated* on a Throne of Glory, beyond which there is no higher Dignity: So *Clemens* makes but two *Orders* of Church Officers, *Deacons* to attend and serve, and *Presbyters* to sit and Judge.

Origen does indeed distinguish 'twixt *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. But no where can I find him founding the Distinction on *Divine* Institution. But I frequently find him *ORIGEN* making most horrid Representations of the Pomp Ann. Chr. 226. & Pride and Prodigality of the Bishops even in these Times of Persecution. Thus, upon these Words *The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion, but it shall not be so among you*, He runs out into a most Lamentable Complaint. ' Thus, saith he (*t*), the Word ' of God teaches us. But we, either not understanding the Will ' of God laid down in the Scripture, or contemning Christ's Re- ' commendation, are such that we seem to exceed the Pride ' even of the wicked Princes of the World: And we not only as Kings ' seek Armies to go before us, but we make our selves terrible and ' most difficult of Access to the Poor; and are such to those who ' apply to us for any Thing, as even Tyrants and the more cruel Prin- ' ces of the World are not towards their Subjects. And we may see ' in some Churches especially of the greatest Cities the Princes (that ' is the *Bishops*) of the Christian People have no Affability, or allow ' Access to themselves. And the Apostle indeed charges even Ma- ' sters concerning their Servants saying, *Masters give unto your Ser- ' vants that which is Just and Equal, knowing that ye also have a Master ' in Heaven*. And he commands them also to forbear *Threatning*. ' But some *Bishops* threaten cruelly, sometimes indeed upon the Oc- ' casion

‘ cation of Sin, but at other Times out of Contempt of the Poor. Thus *Origen*. And all this State which the Bishops took on was the more Intollerable, that their Title to the *Chieftly* seem’d somewhat Dubious to him. ‘ *It shall not be so among you, that is, saith he, Let not* ‘ those who SEEM to have SOME Chieftly in the Church act the ‘ Lords over their Brethren, nor exercise Power over them †.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, as *Dr. Burnet* (v) from his Life written by *Gregory Nyssen* relates his Story, ‘ Being *GREGORIUS* ‘ much set on the Study of Philosophy, was *THAUMATURGUS* ‘ affraid of engaging in the Pastoral Charge, ‘ Ann. Chr. 233. ‘ and therefore avoided all Occasions in ‘ which he might have been laid hold on and Ordain’d: Which ‘ *Phedimus* a Neighbouring Bishop observing, though *Gregory* was ‘ then Distant three Days Journey from him, he did by Prayer De- ‘ dicare him to the Service of God at *Neocesaria* where there were then ‘ but Seventeen Christians; to which the other submitted, and came ‘ and served there. Whether he received any new Orders, is but ‘ dubiously and darkly expressed by that Author. Thus *Dr. Burnet*. From which two Things appear. *First*, That *Imposition of Hands* is not absolutely necessary to make a Church Officer as *Mr. Rhind* would have us believe. *Secondly*, That though *Gregory* was a Bishop, yet it was but of one Congregation, and a very small one too at first, so that he neither had nor needed *Presbyters*.

Cyprian needs not be insisted on. *Mr. Jameson* † and *Mr. Lau-* ‘ *der* * have so learnedly and largely proved that the ‘ *Cyprianic* Bishop had neither absolute Power, nor ‘ *CYPRIAN* ‘ Ann. Chr. 240. Plurality of Congregations, nor a Negative Voice, ‘ nor, in a Word, contributes any Thing to support ‘ the modern Episcopacy; that, to add were superfluous: And there- ‘ fore I must refer the Reader to their Labours.

Basilus

† *Intervos autem qui estis mei, non erunt haec. Ne forte qui videntur habere aliquem in Ecclesia Principatum, dominentur Fratribus propriis, vel potestatem in eos exercent.* *Origen* Tract. 12 in *Matth. Lat. Venetian. L. Parisius. 1654.*

(v) Hist. of the Rights of Princes. p. 29. † *Cypr. Hist.* * The Ancient Bishops considered.

Basilus Magnus in terms asserts the equal Power of all Pastors and Doctors. ' And this, saith he (x), we are
' taught by Christ himself when he constituted Peter *BASILIVS*
' Pastor of his own Church after himself. For he *MAGNVS*
' saith; *Peter lovest thou me more than these; feed my* Ann. Chr. 370.
' *Sheep.* And to all Pastors and Doctors that were
' to come after, he gave an equal Power. And it is a Sign of this,
' that they all in like manner bind and loose as he did. Thus he.

Aerius is confessed to have been *Presbyterian*. But, saith Mr. Rhind, He was an infamous Heretick. Be it so, yet not a greater one than *Tertullian*, whom yet Mr. *AERIUS*
Rhind cited in favours of Episcopacy. For, besides Ann. Chr. 371.
his *Montanism*, some of the Learnedst Doctors in the present *Roman Church* have taken a great deal of Pains, saith Dr. *Symon Patrick* (y) to make the World believe that *Tertullian* and a Number of other Ancient Fathers were infected with the Arian Heresy. But who saies that *Aerius* was a Heretick? Mr. *Rhind* answers, 'twas *Epiphanius Heres*. LXXV. But who knows not that *Epiphanius's* Testimony is of very small Weight? Is it not his known Character that his Learning was above his Judgment, but his Invention above them both? Was there ever a more pitifull Piece written than his Book about *Hereses*? Was there ever any thing weaker than what he has advanced against *Aerius* even upon the Point of *Episcopacy*? Do not the Episcopal Writers (z) themselves own, that he has spoken Nonsense on that Head? Must not every Protestant own that *Aerius* was a better Man than himself and more Orthodox in the Faith, when he condemned Prayers for the Dead which *Epiphanius* undertakes to justify against Him. Is it not known that a great deal more has been said to purge *Aerius* from the Charge of *Arianism* than ever was, or perhaps, can be said for proving him Guilty of it? Mr. *Rhind* then ought to have been a little more modest in his Character of *Aerius*, till he had discoursed the Matter more fully.

Ambrose,

[x] Constitut. Monastic. Cap. XXII. [y] On Bellarmin's II. Note of the Church. [z] Dr. Reynolds Letter to Sir Francis Knolls. Bellarmin. Tom. 1. Contra. 5. Lib. 1. cap. 15.

Ambrose, or the *Hilary* whom I cited before, upon these Words Eph. IV. ij. *And he gave some Apostles.* Gives a plain Account of the Change. ‘*Alter, saith he* **AMBROSE** *Ann. Chr. 376.* ‘(a), that Churches were planted in all ‘Places, and Offices ordain’d, Matters were settled ‘otherwise than they were in the Beginning.----- And thence it ‘is that the Apostles Writings do not in all things agree to the ‘present Constitution of the Church because they were written under the first Rise of the Church: For he calls *Timothy*, who ‘was created a *Presbyter* by him, a *Bishop*: For so at first the ‘Presbyters were called, among whom this was the Course of ‘Governing Churches, that as one withdrew another took His ‘Place, and in *Egypt* even at this Day the Presbyters Ordain in ‘the Bishop’s Absence. But because the following Presbyters began to be found unworthy to hold the first Place; the Method ‘was changed, the Council providing that not Order but Merit ‘should create a Bishop. Thus he And *Augustin*, as *Stillingsfleet* (b) observes, cites these Commentaries with Applause, without Stigmatizing him for a Heretick.

Chrysostom delivers himself with a bundance of Freedom on the Presbyterian Side. ‘The Apostles, saith he (c), having **CHRYSOSTOM** ‘discourf’d concerning the *Bishops* & described *Ann. Chr. 398.* ‘them, declaring what they ought to have, & from ‘what they ought to abstain; omitting the Order ‘of *Presbyters*, he descends to the *Deacons*; and why so, but because ‘between *Bishop* & *Presbyter* there is no great Odds; and to them is ‘committed both the Instruction & the Presidency of the Church: ‘And whatever he said of *Bishops* agrees also to *Presbyters*. In Ordination alone they have gone beyond, and in this only they Seem ‘to defraud † the Presbyters. Thus he. And, saith *Willet* (d) the

[a] Tamen postquam omnibus locis Ecclesie sunt Constituta, & Officia ordinata: Alter composita res est, quam caperat.---Ideo non per omnia conveniunt Scripta Apostoli Ordinationi quæ nunc in Ecclesia est, quia hæc inter ipsa Primordia sunt scripta. Nam & Timotheum Presbyterum a se creatum Episcopum vocat, quia primum Presbyteri Episcopi appelebantur. Ut recedente uno sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Egyptum Presbyteri Consignant, si præfens non sit Episcopus. Sed quia Capereunt sequentes Presbyteri Indigni inveniri ad Primatus tenendos; immutata est Ratio, prospiciente Concilio: Ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet Episcopum, multorum Sacerdotum judicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet & esset multis scandalum. *Amb. 6c* in Eph. 4.

[b] *Irenic*. p. 313. [c] In Prior Ep. ad Tim. Hom. XI.

† Vide I Theff. C. IV. v. 6. in the Greek, and compare it with *Chrysostom's*.

(d) *Synops. Papis. Controv. V. Quest. III. p. 273.*

the Distinction of Bishops and Presbyters, as it is now received, cannot be directly proved out of Scripture: And of this Judgment Bishop Jewell against Harding sheweth Chrysostom to have been. So that here we have two Church of England Divines owning Chrysostom to be on our Side.

Augustin in his Epistle to *Jerom* disclaims the *Divine Institution* of Prelacy and founds it upon *Ecclesiastick Use*.

‘ Although, saith he (e), according to the Words *AUGUSTIN*
‘ of Honour, which Use has now made fashion- Ann. Chr. 420
‘ able in the Church the Episcopate is greater than

‘ the Presbyterate: Yet, in many Things is *Augustin* inferiour to
‘ *Jerom*. That this Testimony is not strained, I appeal to Bishop
‘ *Jewell*’s Declaration. ‘ In St. *Jerom*’s Time, saith he (f), there

‘ were Metropolitans, Archbishops, Archdeacons and others, but

‘ Christ appointed not these Distinctions of Orders from the Begin-
‘ ning. This is the Thing which we defend. St. *Jerom* saith, Let

‘ Bishops understand that they are in Authority over Priests more by Cu-
‘ stom than by Order of God’s Truth. And *Augustin* declares, That

‘ the Office of a Bishop is above the Office of a Priest not by Authority of

‘ the Scripture, but after the Names of Honour which the Custom of the

‘ Church hath now obtain’d. Thus Bishop *Jewell*.

Theodoret in like manner saith (g), ‘ The Apostles call a Pre-

‘ sbyter a Bishop, as we shewed when we

‘ expounded the Epistle to the *Philippians*, which *THEODORET*

‘ may be also learned from this Place, for after Ann. Chr. 430.

‘ the Precepts proper to Bishops, he describes

‘ the Things that agree to Deacons: But, as I said, of Old they cal-

‘ led the same Men both Bishops and Presbyters. Thus *Theodoret*.

‘ *Primasius*, who is said by some to have been *Augustin*’s Disciple

puts the Question *Why the Apostle leaps from the*

Duties of Bishops to the Duties of Deacons with- *PRIMASIUS*

out any Mention of Presbyters; and answers Anno Chr. 440.

plainly

[e] Quamquam enim secundum Honorum Vocabula, quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit. Episcopatus Presbyterio major fit: Tamen in multis Rebus *Augustinus* *Hieronimo* minor est. *Aug. Ep. 15.*

[f] Apolog. Part. II. C. III. Div. 5. [g] In prior Ep. ad Tim. C. III.

plainly as before, *That Bishops and Presbyters are the same Degree (h).*

Sedulius our Countryman, in his *Commentaries* on *Tit. 1.* asserts the Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, that not only the Names are interchangeable, but the Office the same; many of them being to be found in one City; which could not be true of *Diocesan Bishops*.

SEDULIUS the Names are interchangeable, but the Office the same; many of them being to be found in one City; which could not be true of *Diocesan Bishops*. And for Proof and Instance he adduces the Elders of *Ephesus Acts XX*, who dwelling all in one City, though they are called Elders or Presbyters in the 17 *verse* are yet called Bishops in the 28 *verse*. Indeed it was no wonder *Sedulius* was *Presbyterian*: For though he wrote not his *Commentaries* till he went abroad, yet in *Scotland*, where he was born and bred, there was no such thing as a *Bishop* while he lived in it (i); whatever *Spotswood* hath said to the Contrary.

The Second Council of *Sevil* plainly declares, *That though there are many Functions of the Ministry common to the Presbyters with the Bishops, yet BY THE MODERN and ECCLESIASTICAL RULES, there are some Functions denied to them, such as the Ordination of Presbyters (k).*

CONCILIUM HISPALENSE.II. That Council, we see, does not insist upon *Divine Right*, but upon *Ecclesiastical Rules*, and owns the Appropriation of Ordination to the *Bishop* to be a *Modern Practice*.

I might also give the Testimony of *Theophylact*, who is said by some to have flourished about the Year Eight Hunder and Eighty, but placed by *Baronius* in the Year 1071. But his Testimony being the same with that of *Chrysostom* whose *Echo Stillingfleet* calls him, I need not repeat his Words.

Oecumenius, said by some to have lived in the Eight, by some in the Ninth, and by others put off till the Eleventh Century. Upon *Acts XX. 17*, thus delivers himself. 'Many are Ignorant of the Manner especially of the New Testament, whereby Bishops

[h] In I Tim. III. [i] See Dalrymple's Collect. C. IV. V. *Sedulij Poem. Prefat.* Dapin Cent. V. p. 50. [k] Caranz. Summ. Concil. Hispal. Can. 7 p. [mih] 269 Quamvis cum Episcopis plurima illis Ministeriorum communis sit dispensatio, quædam Novellis & Ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita nonerant, sicut Presbyterorum Consecratio.

Bishops are called *Presbyters*, and *Presbyters* *Bishops*. This may be observed both from this Place, and from the Epistle to *Titus*, and from the Epistle to the *Philippians*, and from the first Epistle to *Timothy*. From this Place therefore of the *Acts* we may arrive at the Certainty of this Matter: For thus it is written, *From Miletus he sent and called the Elders of the Church*. It is not said, the *Bishops*; and yet afterwards he subjoins, *Over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops to feed or rule the Church*. And from the Epistle to *Titus*, *That thou mightest appoint Elders in every City*, which *Elders* are afterwards called *Bishops*. And from the Epistle to the *Philippians*. *To all that are at Philippi with the Bishops and Deacons*. And, as I believe, the same may be gathered from the first Epistle to *Timothy*. *If any Man desire the Office of a Bishop, he desires a good Work*. Thus *Oecumenius*.

To all these we may join the *Canon Law*, in which we find Pope *Urban* pronouncing in these Words. *We call the Diaconate and the Presbyterate the Sacred Orders*, *CANON LAW* for these ALONE the primitive Church is read to have had (1).

And now I think I may conclude with *Jerom's* Testimony, who has declared more roundly for *Presbytry*, than any, perhaps all the *Fathers* together ever did for *Episcopacy*. *Jerom*, I say, of whom *Erasmus* witnesseth, *Ann. Chr. 385*. that *He was, without Controversy, the most Learned of all Christians, Prince of Divines, and for Eloquence that he excelled Cicero*. We have heard him already in his famous Epistle to *Evagrius*. And Mr, *Rhind* p. 114 seems as if he would have his Reader believe that that is the only Place in which he declares for *Presbytry*. But herein he imposes upon his Reader: For elsewhere viz. in his *Commentaries* upon the Epistle to *Titus*, he declares yet more explicitly for *Presbytry*, if more can be, than in that famous Epistle. Nor does he manage his Business, as the pretended Patron of *Episcopacy* the false *Ignatius* does his, by a Flow of Words and high ranting Expressions which must needs give Scandal to all the World; but he talks like a Learned Man, reasons the

Y

[1] Decret. ima pars Dist. 65. c. 4. nullus in Epif. Sacros autem ordines dicimus Diaconatum & Presbyteratum. Hos siquidem solos Primitiva legitur habuisse Ecclesia.

the Matter, applies himself to his Reader's Understanding, does not put him off with *Rapture* and *Harangue*, but convinces him by plain downright Argument. I shall give his Testimony at large, & so much the rather, that it contains almost all the *Scripture* Arguments for Presbytry.

' Let us, *saieth he* (m), carefully heed the Words of the Apostle saying, *That thou mayest Ordain Elders in every City as I have appointed thee.* Who, discoursing in what follows what sort of Presbyter ought to be Ordained, says this, *If any one be blameless, the Husband of one Wife &c* afterwards adds, *For a Bishop must be blameless as the Steward of God.* A Presbyter is therefore the same with a Bishop. And before that, by the Devil's Instinct, there were Parties in Religion: And it was said among the People, *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, the Churches were Governed by the Common Council of Presbyters. But after that every one began to think that those whom he had Baptized were his own not Christ's: It was decreed in the whole World, that one chosen from among the Presbyters should be set above the Rest, to whom all care of the Church should belong, and that the Seeds of Schisms might be taken away. If any one think that this is our Judgment, and not the Judgment of the Scriptures that a Bishop and Presbyter are one; and that the one is a Name of Age, the other of Office: Let him read again the Words of the Apostle to the *Philippians* saying, *Paul and Timotheus the Servants of Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons, Grace to you and Peace* and so on. *Philippi* is one City of *Macedonia*; and surely in one City there could not be a Plurality of such as are called Bishops. But because at that Time they called the same Persons Bishops and Presbyters: Therefore he spake indifferently of Bishops as of Presbyters. This may yet seem doubtfull to some, unless it be proven by another Testimony. In the *Acts* of the Apostles it is written, that when the Apostle had come to *Miletus*, he sent to *Ephesus* and called the Presbyters of that same Church, to whom afterward among other Things he said: *Take heed to your selves and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to feed the Church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with*

' with his own Blood. And here observe carefully, how calling
 ' the Presbyters of the *one* City of *Ephesus*, he afterwards calls the
 ' *same* Persons *Bishops*. If any will receive that Epistle, which is written
 ' to the *Hebrews* under the Name of *Paul*; There also the Care of the
 ' Church is equally divided among many: For he writes to the People,
 ' Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves, for they
 ' watch for your Souls as those that must give an Account, that they may
 ' not do it with Grief, for this is unprofitable for you. And Peter
 ' who received his Name from the Strength of his Faith, speaketh
 ' in his Epistle saying, The Presbyters who are among you I exhort,
 ' who am also a Presbyter, and a Witness of the Sufferings of Christ and a
 ' Partaker of the Glory that shall be revealed, feed the Flock of the Lord
 ' which is among you, not as of Necessity but willingly. We have alledg-
 ' ed these Things, that we might shew that among the An-
 ' cients the Presbyters were the same with the Bishops: But that by
 ' little and little the Roots of Dissention might be plucked up, the
 ' whole Care was devolved upon one. As therefore the Presbyters
 ' know that by the Custom of the Church they are Subject to him
 ' who is set over them: So let the Bishops know that they are
 ' greater than the Presbyters rather by Custom, than the Truth of
 ' the Lord's Disposition or Ordering, and that they ought to govern
 ' the Church in Common, imitating Moses, who when he had it in
 ' his Power alone to govern the People of Israel, chose Seventy with
 ' whom he might Judge the People. Thus Jerom. And I know not how
 any Scots Presbyterian could have written more patly in Favours of
 Presbytry. Yet Mr. Rhind has many Things to except against Jerom's
 Testimony: Whom therefore I reserved to the Last, putting him out
 of the due Order of Time, that I might consider these Exceptions with-
 out interrupting the List.

I. He excepts p. 114. ' That Jerom lived too late to Testifie
 ' concerning Matters of Fact that happened about the Beginning
 ' of the Second Century. Now Jerom was born Anno Chr. 329.
 Did he live too late to Testifie of what happened within less than
 200 Years before his Birth? If so, the Testimony of most Part of
 the Fathers, nay indeed of almost all Historians will be of very little
 worth. Do we at this present live too late to Testifie concerning
 the Form of Government which obtained in Scotland about the Year
 1520, when almost every Plowman can tell it was Popery?

II. He excepts, that Jerom is but Testis Singularis. Ibid. 'Tis true,

if a score or more be the same Thing with one, then *Jerom* is *Testis Singularis*. But when we have found so many of the Fathers concurring with him, I need not tell how false that Exception is.

III. He excepts, *Ibid.* 4. That *Jerom* destroys the Credit of his own Testimony, by contradicting himself in this very Point. In *Epist. ad Heliodor.* and *Nepotian* & in *Comment in Ps. 45. vers. 16.* The very Truth is, there are few of the *Fathers* who do not in some Points contradict themselves as well as one another. But, for these Places which Mr. *Rhind* has cited; they signify nothing, unless he had pointed to the particular Words of 'em wherein he thinks *Jerom* has contradicted himself. For Instance, in the *Epist. to Heliodor.* he makes the Presbyters to succeed to the Apostles, and to have the Power of Excommunication &c (n). I apprehend this is no Argument either for *Episcopacy*, or that he has contradicted himself. And that he has neither there, nor indeed any where else contradicted himself in this point; *Stillingfleet* is a pretty competent Witness. Among all the fifteen Testimonies, saith he (o), produced by a learned Writer out of *Jerom* for the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, I cannot find one that does found it upon *Divine Right*; but only on the Convenience of such an Order, for the Peace and Unity of the Church of God.

IV. He excepts, *Ibid.* That it reproacheth the Wisdom of our Lord and his Apostles to suppose that they did establish a Form of Government necessarily productive of Schisms: This is to his old Tune of prescribing to Christ and the Apostles. The Government which they established, which, I hope, we have proven to have been *Presbyterian*, did not necessarily, that is, in the Nature of the Thing, produce Schisms; but by Accident only. Our Saviour foresaw that Schisms would arise even under the Government of Divine Institution. Suppose ye, that I am come to give Peace on Earth, I tell you nay, but rather Division. Luke XII. 51. And the Apostles not only foresaw but felt it. I hear that there be Divisions among you. 1 Cor. XI. 18. And yet they would not prevent them by setting up a Government that should

[n] Abiit ut de his quæquam finitrum loquar, qui Apostolico gradui Succedentes Christi Corpus facere constituent. --- Mihi autem Presbyterum sedere non licet: Illi, si peccavero, licet tradere me Satanæ.

[o] *Ironic* p. 277.

should be utterly incapable of them. No. God had infinitely wise Ends to serve by not doing it. *I hear that there be Divisions (Schisms) among you, and I partly believe it. For there must be also Heresies (Sects) among you that they which are approved, may be made manifest among you.* 1 Cor. XI. 18. 19.

V. He excepts p. 115, ' that it is too severe a Charge to be offered against the Catholick Church, that it would endeavour to ' heal these Breaches by a Device of its own Invention, that is, ' *Do Evil that Good might come of it.* I answer. 'Tis confessed, the Charge is Severe; but that which makes it so is, that it is perfectly true; and not in that only, but in a Thousand other Cases; as is evident from the innumerable Corruptions, which, by Degrees, did overspread the whole Church. And *Whitaker* (Their own *Whitaker*) discoursing of *Jerom's* foresaid Testimonies very frankly tells ' that the Remedy was almost worse than the Disease. ' For as first one Presbyter was set over the rest, and made Bishop; so afterwards one Bishop was set over the rest. And so ' that Custom begot the Pope with his Monarchy, and by little ' and little brought them into the Church. Thus he (p). And 'tis certain that Schisms were never so frequent as after *Episcopacy* prevailed; and *Bishops* themselves were generally either the Authors, Occasion or Fomenters of them. And Ancient Histories supply us with such dreadfull Accounts of such Murder, Bloodshed and Horrid Barbarities, committed by the contending Parties at the Election of Bishops, as are not to be paralleled among the Heathens. So much in Vindication of *Jerom*, who, I hope, is still safe to us after all Mr. *Rhina's* Exceptions.

And now to conclude this Argument: It was so far from being morally impossible that *Prelacy* should obtain, even in spite of the *Divine* Institution of *Presbytry*; that, considering the Corruption of Human Nature, it had been next to a Miracle if it had not obtained. For is there any Thing to which Man is more violently addicted than the thwarting God's Institutions? Did not this Humour

[p] Sed ipso morbo deterius pene Remedium fuit; nam ut primo unus Presbyter reliquis prelatus est, & factus Episcopus: Ita postea unus Episcopus reliquis est Prelatus. Sic ista Consuetudo Papam cum sua Monarchia peperat, & Paulatim in Ecclesiam inexit. *De Regim. Eccles.* p. 542.

Humour begin to work even in the *Paradisical* State? What a fine Speech could Mr. *Rhinda* make to disprove the *Israelits* making the Golden Calf at *Horeb*! 'No. 'Twas morally impossible they should. God had delivered them out of *Egypt* with a mighty hand, and in a wonderfull Manner: He had dryed up the Red Sea before 'em, and drown'd their Enemies in it: He had given them the Law with all the Solemnities of Majesty and Circumstances of Terrour; Therein he had expressly inhibited 'em to make unto themselves any graven Image: They had in the most Solemn Manner Stipulate Obedience. Would they now after all this, within forty Daystoo, so impiously oppose God, so perfidiously violate their own Engagements as to contraveen that Law? No. The *Men* of 'em surely were Masters of more Reason: The *Women* and *Children* were more fond of their Jewels and Ear-Rings, than to part with them to be melted down into an Idol: All of 'em had either a warmer Sense of God's late Mercies, or a more terrible Impression of his Majesty and Justice from the late Appearance he had made on Mount *Sinai*, than to venture on such a Prank. Suppose they had been all willing, yet, would ever *Aaron* have complied with the Motion? No. It must needs be all Legend and Fable. And, which confirms this; *Josephus*, who has given us so Judicious and accurate a History of the *Jews*, is utterly Silent of it. And yet, how impossible soever it was, there is notwithstanding a certain Book which common Folks call the *Bible*, and Christians believe to be the *Divine Oracles* that assures us that the *People* urged it *Aaron* did it, and the molten Calf was set up and consecrate with great Triumph and without Contradiction. *These be thy Gods O Israel which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt*: And without any further *Art* for Conformity the *People* got up early next Morning, and offered up their *Oxen* to the Calf, the God and the Sacrifice being out of the same Herd. So easie a Thing is it to make a Change in Religion to the worse, yea and to bring about an *universal* Compliance with the Change. *Vain Man would be wise, though He be born like a wild Ass's Colt*. There is Nothing Men in all Ages have been more bewitched with than an itch of Refineing upon God's Appointments. And a Conceit that they were able to better them, and that execrable Principle

Principle, *That they had Power to do so*, have been the Original of all the Corruptions that have ever defiled or pester'd the Church. 'Tis Plain that all the Popperies and Ceremonies that have crept into the Worship of God owe their Birth to this. And 'tis no less plain from *Jerom's* former Account, that *Prelacy* was hewn out of the same Quarry. Some aspiring Men have coloured their Ambition with the Pretext of remedying Schisms; and the rest, either through want of Thought or Courage, have been gull'd into a Compliance, or blinded possibly with the hopes, that the Dignity might one Day fall to their own Share. But enough of this.

S E C T. V I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Presbyterian Ruling-Elders and Deacons, are Examined. From P. 102 to P. 107.

THE Main Part of the Controversy viz. *Whether the Order of Bishops as Superiour to Presbyters be of Divine Apostolical Institution*, being thus discussed; we are next to consider what Mr. Rhind has advanced against the Presbyterian Ruling-Elders and Deacons. And first against the Ruling Elders.

ART.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Presbyterian Ruling-Elders, are Examined.

I. **H**E Objects that the *Presbyterian* Ruling-Elder is an Officer of *Calvin's* Institution p. 102. But here His History has failed him: For the Churches of *Bohemia* had such Officers before ever *Calvin* set up the Discipline of *Geneva*. And *Martin Bucer* Divinity Professor in *Cambridge* approved and commended the *Bohemian* Practice; and justified it both from the Scripture and from the Writings of the Fathers. This was long since suggested by the *Presbyterian* Authors (q): And I do not find that ever any Answer was returned to it; But there is no other way of furnishing out of the *Episcopal* Books, but by repeating the same baffled Arguments over and over again. 'Tis plain then, how Modern forever the Order of *Ruling-Elders* may be, yet it is not of *Calvin's* Institution.

II. He objects, *ibid.* 'that such an Officer was never heard of in the Church, till 1500 Years after the sealing of the Canon of the Scripture. But here he is out again in Point of History, yea and contradicts his former Argument: For, by the common Account, the Canon of the Scripture was not sealed before the Year of Christ 96. The Discipline and *Ruling-Elders* were established at *Geneva* in the Year 1542. So that he is wrong in His Account by more than 50 Years, even keeping within the Bounds of the Reformation by *Calvin*.

III. He

III. He objects, *ibid.* that there is not a Title concerning them in the Bible. This is not arguing, but Impudence. We have an Account of them *Rom. XII. 8.* in these Words, *He that ruleth, with Diligence.* And *1 Cor. XII. 28.* we have them mentioned under the Title of Governments. And *1 Tim. V. 17.* *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine.* ‘By which Words, saith Dr. Whitaker ‘in his *Prelections*, the Apostle manifestly distinguisheth betwixt ‘the Bishops and Inspectors of the Church. If all that rule well ‘are worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the ‘Word and Doctrine, it is clear there were some who did not labour: For if they had all done so, the Text had been Nonsense. ‘But the Word *especially* makes the Difference. If I should say, ‘that all these who study at the University are worthy of double ‘Honour, *especially* they who labour in the Study of Theology; I ‘behoved either to mean, that all do not apply themselves to the ‘Study of Theology, or I should speak Nonsense. Wherefore I ‘confess that to be the most genuine Sense of the Text by which ‘the Pastors and Doctors are distinguished from those who only ‘governed *Rom. XII. 8.* And concerning whom we read in *Ambrase* on *1 Tim. V.* Thus that great Light and Patron of the Church of England (r). But what saies Mr. Rhind to it? Not one Syl-
lable. He owns the Presbyterians found upon Texts of Scripture, but is so wise as not to name them, far less to essay to wring them from the *Presbyterian* Sense. And indeed his Conduct in this is wiser than any where else in his Book: For, it would touch any Man of Bowels with Commiseration to see into what various Forms the *Episcopal* Writers twist themselves to avoid the Force of the Text last cited. It has but *fourteen* Words in the Original even *Particles* included; and they have put at least *fourteen* Senses on it. *Didoclavius* discussed *ten* of them in his Days, and they have been ever since inventing new ones: And had Mr. Rhind told us which of ‘em he pitched on, I don’t believe it would be any hard Matter to
Z discuss

discuss that too, unless it be one of his own which the World never yet heard of; for indeed the Sense of the Text is so very obvious, that none can miss it who does not industriously resolve to torture it. He saw very well that he could have made but a scurvy Figure, had he tryed his Critical Talent on it; and therefore he had recourse to the Popular Art of Declaiming against the *Ignorance* or *Disingenuity* of the *Presbyterians*: And every Body must own that this was both more easie and innocent, than if he had fallen to the wresting of Scripture, which would have both exposed his Weakness, and made him Liable to Damnation. And yet he is unlucky even in that same Popular Art, the Episcopal Writers themselves having proclaimed it *Ignorance* to take the said Text in any other than the *Presbyterian* Sense. ‘Art thou so Ignorant, saith the forecited Whitaker (s) to Dury the Scots Jesuit, that thou knowest not that there are *Elders* in the Church of Christ whose Work it is to govern only, not to preach the Word or dispense the Sacraments.

IV. He Objects p. 103, that this, viz. the business of the *Ruling-Elders*, seems to be the weak Side of the Party, their more Learned Advocates having abandon’d its Defence. Who are these pray? Nay, we must wait for a Second Edition of his Book e’re we know that. ’Twas his Business to assert not to prove. For my own part I neither know, nor can hear of any *Presbyterian*, Learned or Unlearned, that has abandon’d its Defence. ’Tis true Mr. Jameson of late has said (t), that the *Ruling-Elders* are not in a *strict Sense* Church Officers, and retracts any Thing he had said before to the contrary. And him indeed I acknowledge to be a very Learned Man. But has he therefore abandon’d the Defence of the *Ruling-Elders*? No. He owns they are the Representatives of the *Sacra Plebs*, He has proved by very many Authorities, *Episcopal* too among the rest that such ought to be in the Church. Nay, the very Argument of his Chapter is *The Divine Right of Ruling Elders sustained*. Where then is that Advocate for Presbytry that has abandon’d its Defence? If any has,

[s] Ita ignarus es, ut esse in Christi Ecclesia Presbyteros nescias qui gubernationi tantum, non verbis tantum Sacramentorum Administrationi operam darentur.

[t] Cyr. Hist. p. 542.

has, we are not likely to be altogether losers, the Advocates for *Prelacy* having taken it up. Not to name again the Learned *Whitaker*, Dr. *Whitby* on the forecited Text has delivered himself according to our Hearts wish. ‘ The Elders, *saieth he*, among the ‘ Jews were of two Sorts. 1st, Such as *governed* in the Synagogue. ‘ And 2^{dly}, Such as *ministred* in reading and expounding their ‘ Scriptures and Traditions, and from them pronouncing what ‘ did Bind or Loose, or what was forbidden, and what was law- ‘ full to be done-----And these the Apostle here declares to be ‘ the most honourable, and worthy of the chiefest Reward: Ac- ‘ cordingly, the Apostle reckoning up the Offices God had ap- ‘ pointed in the Church, places *Teachers* before *Governments* 1 ‘ Cor. XII.

V. He Objects, p. 104, *That all the Ecclesiasticks in the Apostolical Age were initiated into their respective Offices by the Imposition of Hands; whereas Ruling-Elders are admitted by no such Ceremony; or if there be any Solemnity used at all in their Designation to the Office, it is performed by every Parish Minister in his private Congregation; which is contrary to Presbyterian Principles; and is to exercise the sole Power of Ordination, which is not so much as pretended to by Bishops.* ’Tis Answered 1st, The want of the Imposition of Hands will not argue them to be no Church Officers. Not to mention the *Apostles* and *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, of whom before; *Ignatius* himself (if all Traditions are true) was not ordain’d by Imposition of Hands (v). No Body doubts it is very lawfull; and for my own Part I heartily wish it were practised; but I deny that it is absolutely necessary, there being no Precept enjoining it, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost in his extraordinary *Charismata* which accompanied the Imposition of the Apostles Hands being now ceased. And of this Judgment are not only *Presbyterians*, but even the most learned Men of the Church of *Rome* her self, though otherwise so much addicted to Ceremonies. Of this, to omit other Testimonies, that Judicious Historian Father *Paul* informs us (x). ‘ *Melchior Cornelius a Portugal*, *saieth He*, seem- ‘ ed to speak much to the Purpose, who said, the Apostles did un-
Z 2 doubtedly

[v] Dr. Wake’s Genuine Ep. 2d. Edit. p. 44.

[x] Hist. Council of Trent. p. 555.

' doubtedly use Imposition of Hands in Ordination, so that none
 ' is mentioned in the Holy Scripture without that Ceremony; which,
 ' in succeeding Ages was thought to be so essential, that Ordination
 ' was called by that Name. Notwithstanding *Gregory the Ninth*
 ' saith, It was a Rite brought in, and many Divines do not hold
 ' it to be necessary, howsoever others be of the contrary Opinion.
 ' And the famous Canonists, *Hostiensis*, *Joannes Andreas*, *Abbas* and
 ' others do affirm, that the Pope may Ordain a Priest with these
 ' Words only, *Be thou a Priest*, and which is of more Importance,
 ' *Innocentius* Father of the Canonists saith: That if the Forms had
 ' not been invented, it had been sufficient if the Ordainer had used
 ' these Words only; or others Equivalent, because they were insti-
 ' tuted by the Church afterwards to be observed. 2dly, That Bi-
 ' shops do not pretend to the Sole Power of Ordination is shamelessly
 ' false. We have given Testimony before p. 65 that they not only
 ' pretend to it, but practise it. And after that Heap of Proofs which
 ' Mr. *Jameson* has brought in his *Cyprianus Isovimus* for that Purpose,
 ' a Man must be even steel'd in the Forehead that denies it. And
 ' even when the *Presbyters* are admitted to join with the Bishop in
 ' Acts of Ordination, it is merely as Witnesses or Consenters, not as
 ' having the least Share of Power. This, Mr. *Drury* has most round-
 ' ly asserted in the *Vindication* of his Answer to Mr. *Boyse's* Sermon
 ' concerning the *Scriptural Bishop*; and, as I am informed is digni-
 ' fied with the Title of DOCTOR for his Pains. ' All, saith he, that
 ' the *Presbyters* had to do was only to give their Consent, and to
 ' let the Church know that so Sacred an Action was not done rashly,
 ' nor out of Favour and Affection. That they had no Divine
 ' Right to concur with the Bishop, that the Power of Ordination was
 ' in the Bishop alone, the *Presbyters* were only allowed to perform
 ' a share in the outward Ceremony. 3dly, That the Solemnity used
 ' in the Designation of the Ruling Elders to their Office is contrary to
 ' *Presbyterian* Principles, Mr. *Rhind* ought to have proved not merely
 ' asserted: For by doing so he has mightily exposed himself. 'Tis true
 ' it is performed by every Parish Minister in his private Congrega-
 ' tion, he alone enjoins them their Duty, takes their Engagements, and
 ' by solemn Prayer sets them apart for the Office. And, as this is
 ' their constant Practice, so they have still own'd it to be their Prin-
 ' ciple.

ciple, that it is lawfull to do so. But then the Tryal is made by the Minister and *Elderſhip* of the Congregation; or, in want of theſe, by the *Presbytry*; and the *whole People* are by a publick Ediſt allowed, nay required to repreſent their Objections againſt their Admiſſion, if any they have. This is to treat the *People* like rational Creatures: Whereas, the Biſhop's putting men into *Deacon's* or *Prieſt's* Orders privatly in his own Chamber, which was the conſtant Praſtice in the late *Episcopal* Times, not only choaks Reaſon, makes Beaſts of the *People*; but is contrary to the whole Stream of Antiquity, 'The *People* themſelves, as it is in Cyprian (y), having eſpecially the Power of chuſing worthy *Prieſts*, or of rejecting ſuch as are unworthy.

VI. He Objects p. 105, that the Scriptural *Presbyters* were to continue *ad Vitam aut Culpam*. I anſwer, ſo are the *Presbyterian Elders*. For once an *Elder* ſtill an *Elder*, unleſs he is depoſed for Malverſation. If in ſome great Towns they are relieved in Courſe by others, or Honourably diſmiſſed upon their Deſire, when Age diſables them for Service, this is only ſuch an Allowance as was made to the *Levites* under the Law; and therefore is not inconſiſtent with the Character of a *Church Officer*:

VII. He objects, *Ibid.* 'That the *Scriptural Presbyters* were allowed their proper Maintenance, whereas the *Presbyterian Elders* plead no Title to any ſuch Thing, but are rather loſers by the Interruption of their Trades. The Anſwer is plain. The ſame Scripture which founds their Office, entitles them to Maintenance. For the *double Honour* certainly imports no leſs. But that they do not plead it, is, becauſe the Government has ſetled no Fund for that Purpoſe, and that in the preſent Circumſtances they know it would be in vain to plead it. But will that make them no *Church Officers*? Was *Paul* no *Church Officer*, becauſe he made the *Gospel of Chriſt without Charge* 1 Cor. IX 18? Are not the *Episcopal Deacons* *Church Officers*? They are not now provided in any Maintenance, whereas in the *Primitive Church*, they were, as *Jerom* witneſſeth, better ſeen to than the *Presbyters* themſelves (z). 'Tis true the *Presbyterian Elders*

[y] Plebs ipſa maxime habet poteſtatem vel Eligendi dignos Sacerdotes vel indignos recuſandi. Ep. 67.
[z] *Ambr.* *De Virg.* *cap. 10.* *veritate* *Lucernam* *ore*, *Sacerdotio* *effe* *maiores*. Ep. ad

Elders are sometimes avocate from their Employments by their Office : But this only speaks forth their Generous Temper, in that they prefer the publick Service of the Church to their private Interest. Nor are they likely to be losers thereby : For, *God will not be unmindfull, nor forget their Work and Labour of Love.*

VIII. He argues, *Ibid.* ‘ Were there any Foundation for such an Office in the Holy Scriptures, whence was it that *Ruling-Elders* did so early, so universally and so tamely give up their Divine Right, that there is no once Mention made of any such by Divine Right in the *Homilies* and *Commentaries* of the Fathers. For Answer, I shall read to Mr. *Rhind* a *Homily* from the *Commentaries* of one of the *Fathers*. ‘ Age, saith the forecited *Ambrose* or *Hilary* (a), is honourable among all Nations, whence first the Synagogue and afterwards the Church had *Elders*, without whose Council nothing was done in the Church. Which by what negligence it is fall’n into Disuetude, I know not, if it be not through the Sloath or rather Pride of the Doctors, whilst they alone will seem to be something. Thus he. I think it is tolerably clear from this Testimony that there were such *Elders* in the Church at first : For it is not possible *Hilary* could understand either *Bishops* or *preaching Presbyters* by them, seeing these still continued in the Church. And I think it is as clear, that their being disused was owing to the *Prelatick* Spirit of Ambition, which has been the Mother of so many Mischiefs to the Church. ’Tis therefore no wonder that we don’t find the Names of the *Ruling-Elders* in the *Acts* of the General or Provincial *Councils*, when the *Doctors* were of such an usurping Temper. And perhaps that is the Reason why there are so very few *Councils* that had a good Issue, or of whom we have a comfortable Account. Even the Fathers of the first Council of *Nice* were in Peril of throwing their Bibles at one anothers Heads, had not *Constantine* wisely moderated their Choller, and charitably burned their scandalous Libels against one another. Mr. *Rhind* indeed p. 218 taxes the Presbyterians that *they dubbed here a Godly Webster, there a Sanctified*

[a] Nam apud omnes utique Gentes honorabilis est Senectus, unde & Synagoga & postea Ecclesia Seniores habuit, quorum sine Consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia. Quod, qua negligentia aboleverit, nescio, nisi forte Doctorum desidia aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri *Comment. in 1 Tim. 5. 1.*

Sanctified Cobler Ruling Elders. But I cannot see why either the *Webster* or the *Cobler* might not be as usefull Members in a Council as many of the Bishops. For, we have uncontested Evidences (b) that many of them could not read or write their own Name. Mr. *Rhind* ought to have been aware how he inferred that the *Ruling-Elders* are no Church Officers, because they were not present at *Councils*, nor their Names recorded in the *Acts* of them: For, if that Argument be good, it will prove that even the *Episcopal Presbyters* are not Church Officers; *Bellarmin* having shewn (c) at great length, that Prelates alone have Power to Sit and Vote in *Councils*. However, this is enough for the *Presbyterian* Practice, that in the *first* and *best* Council that ever was, I mean that at *Jerusalem Acts XV.* both the *Apostles* and *Elders*, yea and the *whole Church v. 22.* were Members; and the *Acts* and *Decrees* thereof passed, not only by their Advice, but with their Suffrage.

Thus now we have seen that the *Ruling-Elders* are of *Divine Institution*, that they obtained in the *Primitive Church*, that they fell into *Desuetude* through the *Pride* of the Bishops; and that in the *best* constituted Churches in the *World*, they were revived again upon the *first Dawning* of the *Reformation*.

And indeed the *Wisdom* of our Lord and his care of his Church is very much seen in the *Institution*. For, as he has appointed *Ministers*, that the *Faith* of the Church may be kept sound; and *Deacons* that the wants of her poor Members might be supplied: So he has appointed *Ruling-Elders* to oversee the *Manners* and outward *Conversation* of *Christians*, that they be such as become the *Gospel*. Besides, by this *Constitution* the *Discipline* is the more willingly submitted to by the *People*, being exercised by Persons chosen from among themselves, appointed to represent them, to take care of their *Interest*, and that they may have no Reason to complain of the *Rigour* or *Severity* of the *Ministers*. To illustrate this a little from the

Con-

(b) Hefius Episcopus Hadrianopolitanus definiens subscripsi per Romanum Episcopum Myronum, eo quod nesciam Literas. Cajanus Episcopus Phenicensis definiens subscripsi per Coepiscopum meum Dionyium, propterea quod Literas ignorem. Concil. Ephes. 2. in Act. 1. Chalced. Conc. in Crab. Tom. I. p. 530. Conc. Ephes. I. Patricius Presbyter de vico Paradoxilo, manu utens Maximi Compresbyteri, ob hoc, quod Literas ignorem. Zenon Chorepiscopus---- manum accomodavi pro eo ego Flavius Palladius, ob hoc quod presens dixerit Literas se ignorare. in Act. 1. Con. Chalced. in Crab. p. 816. vide plura apud Cheson. Disc. concerning Liturgies p. 196. [c.] De Concil. Lab. 1. Cap. 159.

Constitution of the Civil Government. Princes ordinarily live in State, see Nothing but Coaches and Six, fine Rooms and full Tables; nor does any Body appear before 'em but in his Sunday's Cloaths. All this is very necessary and reasonable; yet it leaves Them very much unacquainted with the Condition of the Country; nor can They have other than a very faint Sense of the Pressures and Calamities Their People may be groaning under: And were the Legislature solely in Their hands, They cou'd hardly escape being blamed for every Thing the People might think a Grievance. But now when a Parliament meets once a Year, the Prince gets the Condition of the People in the most remote Corners of the Kingdom represented: And the People cannot but be satisfied, when they consider they are governed by no other Laws, nor burden'd with other Taxes, than what were asked and enacted with their own Consent; or, which is the same Thing, by Representatives of their own chusing. Just so, Ministers, through their retired Course of Life, are ordinarily very much Strangers to the Way of the World, and are ready to measure the World by the Abstract Notions they have gathered out of Books or from their own Solitary Musings, which don't always suit with the Practical Part of Life. Hence it comes to pass that, till Age and Experience have mellowed 'em, they are apt to have too much Keeness on their Spirits, and to express too much Rigour in their Actions. But *Ruling-Elders* are more conversant in the World, know better what the Times will bear, and what Allowances are necessary to be made in this or that Case. Now when the People (in the Case of Scandals) see themselves judged by such Persons, and that there is no other Discipline exercised on 'em but what even their own Neighbours, as well as their Ministers, think reasonable, they can have no just Cause of Complaint.

To conclude. It is very Strange that the Episcopal Writers shou'd inveigh against Officers whose Province it is only to Govern, not to Preach, I mean by themselves, seeing they have loudly proclaimed to the World, that they look upon their Bishops only as such. Thus, Dr. South (d) in his Sermon preach-

ed

ed at the Consecration of the Bishop of *Rochester* upon *Titus II.* *verse ult.* *These things speak and exhort,* in a flat Contradiction to the Text saies, 'That a reaching Talent is not absolutely necessary in a Bishop, nor is of the vital Constitution of his Function. 'If he have it, it is not to be refused; but if he have it not, it is not much to be desired. And if any of their Bishops do make Conscience of constant preaching, as some of them have done, it is reckoned a *Labour of Love*, as not having a *Care of Souls*. Thus the Bishop of *Sarum* in his Funeral Sermon on Dr. *Tillotson* the late Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. 'In his Function, saith He, He 'was a constant Preacher: For tho' he had no *care of Souls* upon 'him, yet few that had laboured so painfully as he did. And yet the Arch-Bishops and Bishops have, above all the other Clergy, the greatest Honour and the largest Provision. I wonder upon what Account, if it be none of their Duty to *labour in the Word and Doctrine*. And I wonder how *Episcopal* Ruling-Elders can be lawfull, and *Presbyterian* Ruling-Elders not so. But enough of this.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Presbyterian Deacons are Examined.

P. 106. 107,

I. **H**E Objects that *the Primitive Deacons did Preach and Baptize, which the Presbyterian Deacons cannot do, therefore they are not the same.* 'Tis answered. The Scripture Deacons by virtue of their Office were neither to preach nor Baptize, but to *serve Tables*: For the Apostles unloaded themselves of the latter Function,

A a

because

because they could not, with it, discharge the former *Acts* VI. 2 *It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve Tables.* But, saies Mr. Rhind, *Philip* who was ordain'd a Deacon *Acts* VI. did Preach and Baptize *Acts* VIII. 12. 13. 'Tis answered. 1st, We have heard *Hilary* before declaring, that it was allowed to all in the Beginning to preach the Gospel and to Baptize. 2ly, *Philip* was an *Evangelist*, and in that Capacity preached and Baptized. But, saies Mr. Rhind, *we read of no second Ordination He had for these Purposes.* Is not this pretty? Is he not expressly called an *Evangelist* *Acts* XXI. 8. And shall we think he took up the Office at his own Hand, without being ordain'd to it; because we do not read of his Ordination? Or does he think that *Evangelists* had not Power to Baptize? But, adds he, 'we find *Peter* and *John* commissioned by the *Apostles* to confirm the *Samaritans*, which Office *Philip* cou'd have discharged had he been an *Evangelist*. I answer. He could not: For the *Confirmation* that is there meant is the giving of the Holy Ghost in his extraordinary *Charismata*, as is evident from the whole History: And this none but the *Apostles* could give; nor is there one Instance, either in the Scripture or Church History, where ever any but the *Apostles* either did or could give it. But Mr. Rhind has strongly imagined that the present Usage among the *Prelatists* is according to the New Testament Practice; whereas indeed *Episcopal Confirmation* is a thing unheard of in the Scripture, and so is a *baptizing Deacon*. Nor can I look upon Baptism administred by an *Episcopal Deacon*, any otherwise than as if it had been administred by a *Webster* or *Cobler* Ruling Elder or Deacon among the *Presbyterians*. I'm sure there is not the least Countenance for it in the Scripture. I'm sure the very Design of the Deacon's Office declares that *Baptizing* is no part of it. I'm sure likewise the *Presbyterian Deacon* is the only *Deacon* by Scripture warrant, when the word is taken as signifying an Officer inferior to a *Presbyter*.

II. He objects 'That the ancient Deacons did constitute one of the Ordinary and perpetual Orders of Ecclesiasticks, whereas the *Presbyterian Deacons* are only in a few of the larger Towns, there being none such in any other Part of the Nation.' 'Tis answered. They are in every Congregation where they can be had. And

And to my certain Knowledge in the *lesser* as well as *larger* Towns; yea in many *Country* Congregations. And every Minister is posed upon it by the Presbytry twice a Year, whether his Session be constitute with Deacons as well as Elders. Possibly some Congregations may have little or no Stock; and perhaps as few Poor that want it. What is the great Hazard tho', in such a Case, they have no *Deacons*? O, saith Mr. Rhind, *It's a fundamental Defect if they believe them to be of Divine Institution.* Very well argued! As if *Deacons* were absolutely necessary to the Constitution of a Church. But Time was when there were no such Officers in Being, nor any Order for them: Nor in all probability would there ever have been any, had not the emergent Circumstances of the Church made it necessary. How many Instances have we in Church History of *Bishops* without *Presbyters*? But was that a fundamental Defect? Or would it be sufficient whereupon to infer, that *Presbyters* are not Church Officers; or that the Office is not of Divine Institution? 'Tis *Nauseous* to answer such Stuff. So much for the Presbyterian Deacons.

The Conclusion of the Chapter concerning Church-Government.

THUS now I have got through the Controversy of the *Government* of the Church; and hope I have made it sufficiently clear that, neither from the Nature of the Thing, nor the Form of Government among the *Jews*, nor Political Necessity, nor the Institution of our Lord, nor the Practice of the Apostles, nor the pretended Episcopacy of *Timothy* and *Titus*, nor the Apocalyptic Angels, nor the Testimony of Antiquity, nor indeed from any Thing else Mr. Rhind has advanced, does it appear that by Divine Right there *is*, or *ought* to be any Officer in the Church superiour to the preaching Presbyter. Consequently the Presbyterian Government

is not Schismatical, but that which was originally instituted, and did at first obtain. Consequently Mr. Rhind in separating from, it (the same is to be said of all others in his Case) is become a *Schismatick*. Consequently *Episcopal* Ordination is so far from being necessary, that it is *without*, and therefore contrary to *Divine* Institution.

And now to conclude. I cannot but look upon it as one of the nicest Turns I ever heard was given to a Cause, that our *Scotch* Episcopalians who, the other Day while they were in Possession, were glad to find a few Colours, and watery ones they were God wot, to prove *Episcopacy* *Lawfull*; and would have been heartily well content if People would have acquiesced in it as *Tolerable*; that they, I say, should, now when they had lost all, set up for the *Absolute Necessity* of it, and hope to recover the Saddle by that Politick; I cannot help saying in the Words of *Catullus*.

Res est Redicula & nimis Jocosæ.

'Tis much such an other Trick as the Church of *Rome* serves the Protestants: When she finds her Religion almost one continued Scab of Errours and Corruptions, she puts on a brazen Impudence, and will needs have them to dispute her Infallibility. I must then advise our *Episcopal* Writers to be so modest as not to grasp at all; but to content themselves, as their Fathers did before them, with Essays to prove the *Lawfulness* of *Episcopacy*, without insisting on the *Necessity* of it. And as for others, besides the Clergy, who are become Disciples to this new *Hypothesis*, I cannot but seriously exhort them to consider the horrid Uncharitableness and bloody Cruelty of it, no where to be paralleled except amongst the most bigotted *Papists*. I crave leave then to address you in a few Words.

I hope, *Gentlemen*, you know that there are other Churches in the World besides the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, which neither believe the *Necessity* of Bishops, nor maintain Union with them. There are our Brethren Dissenters in *England* and *Ireland*, a pretty considerable Body. There was the *French* reformed Church while she stood, and what yet remains of Her in a dispersed Condition. There are the *Belgick* Churches, the Church of *Geneva*, the Reformed

med *Cantons* with their Protestant Confederates; and *New-England* on the other Side of the World, all which own no such Office as that of a Diocesan Bishop. Now, pray *Gentlemen*, do ye think it Nothing to unchurch all these; and, which is the necessary Consequence of that, to give them to the Devil; when yet all the World sees that, generally speaking, their Conversation is at least as good and as becoming the Gospel as your own? Do ye think it nothing, by your bigotted Notions thus to weaken the *Protestant* Interest, and to make such a dangerous Concession to the *Papists*, that so fair a Part of the Protestant World is in a State of Schism, out of Favour with God, and incapable of Salvation: And all this merely for the want of *Prelates*, of whom there is not the least Mention in Scripture?

And yet the malign Influence of your Principle does not sist within these Bounds I have mention'd. No. All the Churches who have only *Superintendents* are in quite as dangerous a Condition as the former. For, besides that these *Superintendents* positively disown their Superiority over their Brethren to be by *Divine* Right; we have p. 45 heard M. *Dodwell* declaring, that they are not sufficient for a Principle of Unity, and consequently cannot be the *Medium* of Union with Christ. Now, pray consider what a Havock this must needs make of the remaining Protestant Churches. Left you should think me partial in giving the Detail of 'em, take it in *Stillingsfleet's* Words. ' In *Holstein*, saith he (e), ' *Pomeran*, *Meclenburg*, *Brunswick*, *Lunenburg*, *Bremen*, *Oldenburg*, ' *East Friesland*, *Hessen*, *Saxony*, and all the upper Part of *Germany*, ' and the Protestant Imperial Cities, Church-Government is in the ' Hands of *Superintendents*. In the *Palatinate* they have *Inspectors* ' and *Præpositi*, over which is the Ecclesiastical Consistory.---- And ' so they have their *Præpositos* in *Wetteraw*, *Hessen* and *Anhalt*. ' And in *Transylvania*, *Polonia* and *Bohemia* they have their *Seniores*. ' All these, he adds, acknowledge no such Thing as a Divine Right ' of Episcopacy, but stiffly maintain *From's* Opinion of the Primitive Equality of Gospel Ministers. And therefore they must all go over at the same Ferry with plain Parity Men; and you know you

you have assigned them but indifferent Quarters against their Landing.

Yet further, even in *Denmark*, *Norway* and *Sweden*, tho' there are a few that have the *Name* of Bishops; yet they are very far from being looked on as the Center of Union, or mystical High Priests, or the visible representatives of God and Christ, by whom alone People can have Union with the Divine Persons, which is your Scheme. No, They have no such Whimsies among them on the contrary Writers speak most diminutively of their Power. ' Here, viz. in *Denmark* ' (saith the Author of the *present State of Europe* for the Year 1705 ' p. 134) are *Bishops*, but they are not much different in Effect from ' *Superintendents* in other Places, depending on the Superiour Con- ' stitutions. ' And (saith the excellent Author of the *Account of Denmark* ' for the Year 1692, Third Edit. p. 231.) there are Six Superin- ' tendents in *Denmark*, who take it very kindly to be called Bi- ' shops and My Lord. There are also four in *Norway*. These have ' no Temporalities, keep no Ecclesiastical Courts, have no Ca- ' thedrams, with Prebends, Canons, Deacons, Sub-Deacons, &c. ' But are only *Primi inter Pares*. Thus he. And 'tis certain, that in the Beginning of the Reformation it was *Bugenhagius* (who was but a Presbyter) that ordain'd their first seven Superintendents or Bishops from whom all their Succession to this Day does flow (f). The same is the Case of *Sweden*. ' The Archbishops and Bishops ' of this Kingdom (saith the forecited Author of the *Present State of* ' *Europe* p. 147) retain little more than the Name, and a bare ' Primary sort of Superiority over other Superintendents, the establi- ' shing of the *Lutheran* Religion having deprived them of the Eccle- ' siastical Jurisdiction, which they exercised before the Reforma- ' tion. Thus he. And to the same Purpose *Stillington* (g) concern- ' ing both these Kingdoms. ' In *Sweden*, saith he, there is one Arch- ' bishop and Seven Bishops, and so in *Denmark*, though not with ' so great Authority.

By this Calculation, the whole forreign Reformed Churches will be found to be of Presbyterian Principles, and consequently
not

[f] Vide Chytræum Saxon p. 43+.
[g] Item. ubi supra.

not a true Church among 'em all by your Scheme. You'll perhaps say that as for *Sweden* and *Denmark* 'tis enough to save 'em from the Guilt of Schism, that they have such as are called *Bishops*, how small soever their Authority be, and tho' the *Divine* Institution or *Necessity* of them is not believed. But, pray *Gentlemen*, consider, if their *Practice* save them from the Guilt of *Schism*, does not their *Belief* involve them in the Guilt of *Herésie*? If Union with the Bishop be by Divine Command a necessary Duty, then certainly the Belief of it is a fundamental Article, and consequently the denying thereof, as all those of the *Lutheran* Communion do, must be *Herésie*. And so you have very charitably disposed of all the Protestant Churches, sending them whole Sale to Hell upon the Account either of *Herésie* or *Schism*.

I foresee what Reply you'll make to all this, viz. that the *Uncharitableness* of a Doctrine is no Argument against the *Truth* of it. That our Thoughts don't alter the Nature of Things, nor can change Divine Establishments: And therefore if it be true that *Episcopal* Ordination is necessary to make a Minister, without which his Acts are not valid; and that Union with the Bishop is necessary to eternal Life, without which People cannot expect it: Be the Consequences of this never so heavy, or extend themselves to never so many, that is what you cannot help: The Truth must be maintain'd; and that you express your Charity sufficiently by telling us of our Danger, and that it would be the most uncharitable thing in the World to conceal the same from us, or to shew it less than really it is. To which I answer. 'Tis very true, our Thoughts don't alter the Nature of Things, nor will your Rigour or our Charity make the other's Principles either truer or false. But tho' it do not *make*, yet it may go a great length to *shew* whether they be true or false. For, 'tis a shrewd Presumption in most Cases, that the Opinion which wants Charity is not from God, and that the Error lyes on the Damning Side. This the Divines of the Church of *England* have oftentimes observed in their Disputes against the Church of *Rome*; But their late Writers for *Episcopacy* quite forget it in dealing with the Presbyterians. A good and wise Man, even tho' he have the Truth on his Side, will yet make all the Allowances the Case will reasonably bear for those that differ from him. He will consider
that

that their dissenting from him may proceed from Education, the Difficulty of the Controversie, the want of due Helps or of a suitable Genius and Capacity. And if he himself make Allowances for them on these or the like Accounts; He will readily believe that a mercifull God will do so much more. But when a Man's Mind is darkned with Errour, at the same Time his Temper is sowed: And because he cannot *Reason* others into the same Opinion with himself, therefore he essays to *fright* them into it with the Argument of Damnation. And this, *Gentlemen*, I must take the Freedom to say, I apprehend to be your Case. For, Pray, whence all this Height? On what is all this Assuming in your own Case founded? Mr. *Rhind*, to give him his due, has laid out all your best Arguments in their Strength, and set them off with Abundance of Elegancy; I appeal to your selves whether every one of them is not answered to Satisfaction.

I. Is it on the *Scriptures* you found? M. *Dodwell* has fairly quitted that Fort, and frankly owns that your *Prelacy* is not to be found there: And that the Original of it is at least *ten* Years Posterior to the Sealing of the Canon of the Scripture, and half a *Dozen* years to the Death of *John* the longest lived of the Apostles. And as to the Business of *Ordination* which you so much insist on, He not only supposes (*b*) that *Presbyters* might chuse their *Bishop*, might use all the Ceremonies of *Consecration* to him, might invest him in his Office by *Prayer* and *Imposition of Hands*: But also tells, 'that he is apt to think that this *must* have been the Way observed at first in the making of *Bishops*. Now, if the *Presbyters* have Power of Ordaining *Bishops*, is it not strange that they should want the Power of Ordaining *Presbyters* like themselves? Has God any where forbidden it? No. But Mr. *Dodwell* would persuade us of it by a *Simile*, which yet is but a weak way of arguing, *viz.* That as though a Prince is inaugurated by his Subjects, yet when once he is inaugurated, they have not any Power over him, nor can act any thing without him, or withdraw their Obedience from him, so neither can the *Presbyters*, when once they have Ordain'd a Bishop over themselves, do any Thing either without him or in Opposition to him; and that all such Acts are not only

only punishable but invalid. But all this Reasoning is founded on two most precarious Suppositions *viz.* 1st, That the Presbyters are obliged to have a Bishop over them. And 2^{dly}, That every Bishop is a Monarch in his own Diocese, for which there is just as much to be said as there is for the *French King's* being Universal Monarch of the World, or the *Pope* of the *Catholic Church*. Such Things ought to be *proved* not *presumed*; so much the rather that in Fact we find the Presbyters of the Church of *England*, even the *High-Church* Presbyters, have disowned that Principle. For, in the late famous Contests between the two Houses of *Convocation*, the Plurality in the *lower House* assumed to themselves a Power over, and set themselves in opposition to their Superiours: And would needs have their *Metropolitan* and *Bishops* to be accountable to them for their Conduct in their Visitations, they wou'd needs censure the Bishop of *Sarum's* Book on the XXXIX Articles: Nay wou'd need's sit, and act too, after the *Metropolitan* their President had adjourned them. By this Conduct of theirs they broke through the *Ignatian* and *Dodwellian* Scheme at once, and loudly proclaimed to the World that they did not believe their Bishops to be absolute Monarchs. Thus the Presbyterians were beholden to the *lower House of Convocation*. But indeed the *upper House* obliged them no less. For, the *lower House*, apprised of the Constructions were made of their Actings, on Dec. 11. 1702 sent a Declaration to the *upper House* whereof the Import was, *That whereas they had been scandalously and maliciously represented as Favourers of Presbytry, in Opposition to Episcopacy, they now declared, That they acknowledged the Order of Bishops, to be of Divine Apostolical Institution.* Several of the *lower House* had dissented from this Declaration, and refused to subscribe it. But did not their *Lordships* in the *upper House* go in to it? No. Notwithstanding the *lower House* by an *additional Address* begged their *Lordships* to abett and support the fore said Doctrine, yet their *Lordships* objected against the Legality of asserting it, and in end flatly refused it. So that, even in *England* it self, to this Day there has never been any Declaration made of the *Divine* Institution of *Prelacy* either by *Parliament* or *Convocation*: Nor can I find that there is any Thing in any of their publick *Formula's* asserting it, except some Words in the Preface to the Form of

Ordination, which are too loose and weak to bear such a Weight. And 'tis certain, that, at the Reformation, *Prelacy* was set up in *England* on a far different Footing from that of *Divine Right*. For in *K. Henry the VIII's* Reign Anno 1539. ' The Bishops, saith Dr. Burnet (i), took out Commissions from the King, by which they ' acknowledged that all Jurisdiction Civil and Ecclesiastical flowed ' from the King, and that they exercised it only at the King's ' Courtesie, and that as they had it of his Bounty, so they wou'd be ' ready to deliver it up at his Pleasure, and therefore the King did ' empower them *in His stead* to Ordain, give Institution, and do all the ' other Parts of the Episcopal Function. Upon which the *Historian* makes this Remark, *By this they were made the King's Bishops indeed.*

Nor was the Matter mended by *K. Edward VI.* ' In the first ' Year of whose Reign, says the same *Historian* (k), all that held ' Offices were required to come and renew their Commissions. ' Among the rest the Bishops came, and took out such Commissions ' as were granted in the former Reign viz. to hold their Bishop- ' ricks during pleasure, and were empowered in the King's Name, ' as *His Delegates*, to perform all the Parts of the Episcopal Fun- ' ction, and *Cranmer* set an Example to the rest in taking out one ' of them. And indeed *Heylin* acknowledges (l) that *K. Edward's* first Parliament forced the Episcopal Order from their strong Hold of *Divine Institution*, and made them no other than the *King's Ministers only.*

Upon this Footing was Prelacy settled even in *England* at the Reformation: And I challenge any Man to produce Documents where ever to this Day they have bettered its Foundation, or settled it upon Scripture Authority or Divine Institution. And must the *Scots* Presbyterians be *Schismaticks* for not believing what the whole Forreign Protestant Churches have declared against, and *England* her self durst never assert. *Gentlemen*, I can assure you there is Nothing in the World makes a Party appear with a more Contemprible Figure than weak Arguments and a high Air. Please there-

[i] Hist. Reform. Abridg. Vol. I. p. 228.

[k] Ubi supra. Vol. II. p. 4. [l] Hist. Edw. VI. p. 52.

therefore only to low'r your Air in proportion to your Arguments, and I hope it will be no hard Matter to deal with you. 'Tis true your late Writers will needs perswade you that all Christianity depends on Prelacy, and that there cannot be any Church where it obtains not; and their Plot, *viz.* The Ruin of the whole Protestant Interest through the World, is too evident either to be mistaken by us, or coloured by themselves. But I must tell you that *Cranmer, Therleby, Redman, Cox, Whitgift, Cosins, Low, Bridges, Hooker, Dounham, Willet, Mason, Chillingworth, Sutcliffe*, and all those great Names who, for several Scores of Years after the Reformation, baffled Popery by their Arguments, or gave Testimony against it by their Blood; tho' they were deeply engaged in the Interests of Prelacy, and loved it with their Soul; yet they still either deny'd the *Necessity* of it, or frankly disowned its being founded on *Scripture*. And when the *Scripture* Fort is forsaken, pray what will ye betake your selves to. For

II. Will you found on the *Fathers*? 'Tis true your Writers amuse you with their Names, and dazle your Eyes with Citations out of 'em which mention *Bishop* and *Presbyter* as distinct. But, pray desire them to cite the *Fathers* declaring for the *Divine Right* of that Distinction, as the Presbyterians cite them declaring for their *Scripture Identity*. Without this, all their Endeavours are only a Learn'd Labour to buble the World, and does either discover their own, or presume their Readers want of Judgment. *Stillingsfleet* has spoken ingenuously on the Head. 'As to the Matter it self, saith he (*m*), I believe upon the strictest Enquiry *Medina's* Judgment will prove true; That *Jerom, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact*, were all of *Aerius's* Judgment as to the Identity of both Name and Order of Bishops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church. I have shewn how, not only these but several others of the *Fathers* are on the *Presbyterian Side*; and acknowledge not only that the Names *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are Common; but also that the Office and Character was the same in the Apostolick Times. I have produced them interpreting the Scriptures that relate to this Controversy, as

B b 2

the

the *Presbyterians* now do. I have shewn that the Divines of the Church of *England*, even her *Bishops* and *Doctors* acknowledge the Fathers to be one the Side of *Presbytry*. If the *Episcopal* Writers can produce as many of the Fathers declaring as expressly for the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters by *Divine Right*; if they can find them interpreting the Scriptures that Way, and then back all with the Approbation of our *Presbyterian* Writers, as I have done what I alledged with the Approbation of the *Episcopal*; I hereby engage to become their Profelyt. If this is not to be done, you must blame your selves you have not moe Disciples. But, 'tis high Time to proceed with Mr. Rhind.

C H A P. III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Second Reason for seperating from the Presbyterian Party viz. That their Articles of Faith are fundamentally False and Pernicious, is Examined. From P. 119. to P. 148.

THIS is a very high Charge, and for making it Good He insists against the Doctrine of the *Decrees* in general; the Decrees of *Predestination* and *Reprobation* in particular, the Doctrine of the *Efficacy of Grace*, and the Doctrine of the *Perseverance of the Saints*. For Answer, I shall first particularly consider his Objections against these Doctrines, and Secondly prove that they are the Doctrines of the whole *Christian Church*.

S E C T. I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Objections against the Presbyterian Articles of Faith, are considered.

IN the First Place Mr. Rhind insults against the Doctrine of the *Eternal Decrees* in General, which in the *Westminster Lesser Catechism* are defined to be *God's eternal Purpose, according to the Counsel of His own Will; Of the Divine Decree, whereby, for his own Glory, He hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.* One wou'd think the Truth of such a Doctrine was beyond Debate. For, doth not the Infinite Perfection of the Divine Nature, and the Dependence of the Creature upon God, in its *Actions* as well as *Being*, argue such Decrees? Does not the infallible Omniscience of God necessarily infer them? Is it possible otherwise to conceive how Events, that flow from Rational free-Agents, or depend upon Contingent Causes, shou'd be certainly *known*, when they are not certainly to *be*? Does Mr. Rhind think that God has forsaken the Earth, or laid the Reins on the Neck of the Creatures, allowing them to hurry both themselves and him whither they list? Has he formed his Notions of the Deity upon *Lucretius's* System, who would Complement him out of his Concernment for the World

*Immortali ævo summa cum Pace fruatur
Semota a nostris Rebus sejunctaque longe.*

Or doth he think Him such a one as himself, to take His Measures

upon

upon the Spot as he sees Things are likely to frame? In the Confidence of what did he oppose such a Doctrine?

Why, *saieth He* p. 120, Nothing comes to pass more frequently than Sin: And therefore if God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, then it will follow that God has ordain'd Sin, and consequently must be the Author of Sin, which is Blasphemous, and destroys the Essential Distinction 'twixt good and evil, all Just Notions of God, the Natural Freedom of Man's Will, takes away Rewards and Punishments, and in a Word excuses the Sinner and lays the Blame upon God. This is the full Sum of what he has offered against the *Presbyterian* Doctrine of the *Decrees*. But

I. These are not *Arguments* against, but *Consequences* wrung from it; *Consequences* too which the *Presbyterians* refuse with Abhorrence, and that in their publick *Formula's*. Thus in their *Confession of Faith* (n) They Teach, ' That God from all Eternity did by the ' most wise and Holy Council of His own Will freely and un- ' changably Ordain whatsoever comes to pass: Yet so, as that ' neither is God the Author of Sin, nor is Violence offered to the ' Will of the Creatures, nor is the Liberty or Contingency of second ' Causes taken away but rather established. 'Tis therefore not only uncharitable but unjust to load the Doctrine with such Consequences, when they expressly declare that they do not understand the *Doctrine* in such a Sense as to admit of these *Consequences*.

II. Cannot Mr. *Rhind* conceive, that 'tis very possible for the Divine Majesty to decree the *Event*, without decreeing the *Sin* that adheres to it, any further than that he will permit, direct, and overrule it, to serve his own wise and Holy Ends? Whether he can conceive it or not, there is no one Thing more expressly laid down in the Scripture than this. I am very sure that *Shimei* sinned grievously in cursing *David*, and yet I am as sure that the Lord said unto him *Curse David* (o). I am sure it was with wicked Hands that *Herod*, *Pontius Pilate* and the People of the *Jews* took and crucified and slew the Son of God (p). But I am as sure, not only that *He was delivered by the determinate Council and Foreknowledge of God*, but also that *They did Nothing to him but what God's*

God's Hand and Council determined before to be done (q). Are the Expressions in the Presbyterian Catechism harder than these of the Scripture? And must not *Presbyterians* teach as the Scriptures do, because Mr. Rhind will needs harangue a little against them?

III. How does the Decree of God excuse the Sinner? Does not Mr. Rhind know, that it is not the Decree but the Precept that is given to be the Standard of our Obedience? No indeed; this Mr. Rhind knew not, or did not advert to: For he has expressly made the Decrees and the Commands of God the same Thing; and the Decrees to be the Rule of our Duty. If, saith he p. 121, *God has decreed Sin, it is our Duty to commit it, His Commands being the Standard of our Obedience.* This is a horrid Blunder he has made. So far are the Decrees from being the Rule of our Duty, that it is both impossible to know them, and a Crime to enquire into them any further than as God has revealed them in his Word. *Secret Things belong unto the Lord our God: But those Things which are revealed belong unto us.* (r) And therefore God very justly punishes the Sinner, not for fulfilling his Decrees in which he was not concerned; but for transgressing his Precepts which he had revealed to him. God decreed that the Son of Man should be betrayed & betrayed by Judas too. *The Son of Man goeth as it was determined (s)*, yet this Decree could not excuse Judas, because he neither designed the fulfilling of it by his Treachery, nor indeed was it given him as the Rule of his Behaviour: And therefore 'tis presently added *Wo unto that Man by whom he is betrayed.* And therefore when Mr. Rhind affirms p. 130 'That it is Nonsensical and Blasphemous to suppose that God's *secret and revealed Will* are not one, He contradicts express Scripture, and thereby makes himself guilty of that Blasphemy he imputes to others.

IV. Whatever Difficulties there are in the Presbyterian Doctrine of the Decrees, the *Arminians* must be intollerably fancifull, if they do not own, that they are at least equal on their Side; with this very considerable Difference, that generally the Objections against the

[q] Acts IV. 27. 28.

[r] Deut. XXIX. 29. [s] Luke XXII. 22.

the *Presbyterian* Doctrine arise from pretended *Reason*: Whereas the Objections against the *Arminian* Doctrine are founded, not only upon plain *Reason*, but express Declarations of *Scripture*: And where these are, and the Contest is 'twixt seeming *Reason* and the clear *Revelation* of God; it seems but good Manners to yield to God. Mr. Rhind cannot digest this Doctrine of the *Decrees*, because he cannot (without submitting his Judgment to the Scriptures) by meer Strength of Natural Reason answer all the Difficulties & Objections that may be brought against it. But can he answer all the Difficulties & Objections against a Trinity of Persons in the Divine Nature? Can he answer all the Objections that may be made against the Resurrection of the Body after the Infinite and inconceivable Changes which Time and Corruption bring upon it? If he can answer these, I say, upon the meer Strength of Reason; it must be owned he is the ablest Divine the World was ever yet blessed with. If he will not believe them, because he cannot answer all Objections against them; then 'tis plain he ought to have continued in his State of *Discreet Scepticism* to this Day. But if he can believe these Doctrines notwithstanding his inability to solve the Difficulties that hang on 'em; why might he not also believe that *God has decreed whatever comes to pass*; for the one is as plainly revealed in the Scripture as the other. And

V. There is so much the more Reason for this, that the Belief of the *Decrees* is necessary in order to the Conduct of Life. For when I am afflicted by the Hands of wicked Men and suffer from their Sins, how shall I possess my Soul in Patience, or keep my self from Revenge; if I don't believe that, tho' God is absolutely free of their Sin, yet he uses them as the Tools and Instruments of his Providence for serving his Purposes upon me, and that such Things were measured out for me by his Decree. It was upon this Consideration that *Job* sinned not, nor charged God foolishly, notwithstanding the Injuries the *Sabeans* and *Caldeans* had done him. It was this preserved *Joseph* from all Resentment against his Brethren for their Barbarous Usage of him, *Ye thought Evil against Me, but God meant it unto Good*. Gen. 50. 20. It was upon this that *David* quieted his Spirit, and was Dumb not opening his Mouth, because the Lord had done it Psalm XXXIX. 9. And what God does in Time without Sin, might he

he not from all Eternity decree without Sin. It was upon this Argument that our Blessed Saviour bore the Contradictions and Cruelty of Sinners with a perfect Composure of Spirit. *The Cup that my Father hath given me to drink shall I not drink it.* John XVIII. 11. Nay, even a Heathen *Seneca* prescribes the belief of the Doctrine of the Decrees to his Friend as a Remedy against all ruffling of Spirit under Injuries and Troubles. 'Losses, saith he (t), 'Wounds, Fears are come upon you; these Things are usual. That's 'little, these Things are needfull, they are Decreed and don't come 'by Chance. I hope then in all this Doctrine there is nothing either false or pernicious, much less any Thing that is Fundamentally so.

In the Second Place, Mr. Rhind insists against the Presbyterian Doctrine of Gods Irrespective Decrees relating to Mankind contain'd in their Confession of Faith Of the Decree of Chap. III. viz. That God has, by his Eternal and immutable Purpose & the secret Counsel and good Pleasure of his own Will, chosen some to everlasting Life, without any Foresight of Faith or good Works or Perseverance in either of them. And that he hath, by the same Eternal and unchangable Council of his own Will, pass'd by, and ordain'd others to Wrath for their Sin. 'This Doctrine, he 'argues, contradicts the Holiness, Justice and Truth of God, is contrary to the Design of all Revelation, and to express Testimonies 'of Scripture, and is perniciously influential upon Christian Life. p. 122.-----135. 'Tis against my Will that I engage in this mysterious Controversy, in which every Man ought to be Wise to Sobriety. But, I hope, it will not be difficult to suggest as much, as will take off Mr. Rhind's Objections, without going beyond my Line. For answer then

I. It is abundantly Strange that this Doctrine shou'd be opposed by such as have read the Scripture and the Epistles of Paul, who has insisted on it at large in the Eighth and Ninth Chapters of the Epistle to the Romans; and besides has frequently asserted it here and there in particular Hints which Mr. Rhind p. 132. very man-

C c

nerly

[t] Damna, Vulnera, Metus inciderunt; solet fieri. Hoc parum est, debuit fieri. Decernuntur ista, accidunt, Senec. Ep. 96.

nerly calls *dismembred Shreds*, as if the Apostle had lost his Connexion always when he touched on that Doctrine. But what can Mr. Rhind say to those many Places of Scripture, which he cannot but know are insisted on by the *Presbyterians* in Defence of that Doctrine? Why, he has rid his Hands of 'em by one fearless Stroke, boldly pronouncing, in the place just now cited, That these are the Passages *hard to be understood* pointed at by the Apostle Peter, II. Ep. III. 16, *which some wrest to their own Destruction*. But who told him that Peter pointed at these Passages? Did any Spirit reveal it to him? Do the Church of England Doctors teach him so? No surely. Drs Hammond and Whitby, the two most famous Expositors that have yet appeared, assert, that it is the Doctrine of the *coming of our Lord* that Peter there points at, and not the Doctrine of Predestination, or any Thing near it. And, if Mr. Rhind had consulted the Greek Original, he had seen that Peter did not refer to Paul's Epistles, but to the Subjects he had been treating of, when he used these Words *In which there are some Things hard to be understood*.

II. 'Tis very true the *Presbyterians* teach, that by the Decree of God, for the Manifestation of his Glory, some Men are Predestinated unto Everlasting Life, and others foreordained to Everlasting Death: And there does indeed lye a shrewd Objection against it viz. *That it is not in the Power of Man to prevent his own Damnation, if he has been foreordain'd to it*: But then (which might have discouraged Mr. Rhind to bring it into the Field again) the Apostle Paul both foresaw it & silenced it Rom. IX. 14. &c. *What shall we say then? Is there Unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have Mercy on whom I will have Mercy, and I will have Compassion on whom I will have Compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth Mercy*.....Therefore hath he Mercy on whom he will have Mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto Me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his Will? Nay but, O Man, who art thou that repliest against God? Here is a full Assertion and fair Vindication of the *Presbyterian* Doctrine; and whatever Objections our Minds may raise against it, yet there is no one Doctrine more clearly expressed or strongly asserted in all the Scripture than this. And, which confirms all, 'tis beyond all Controversy, by Observations from Providence, that
God

God acts with an Absolute Sovereignty even in the Dispensations of the Means of Grace in Time, which is a certain Document that he acted the same Way in His *Eternal Decrees*. The World was for many Ages delivered up to Idolatry; and since the Christian Religion has appeared, we see vast Tracts of Countries which have continued ever since in Idolatry: Others are fallen under *Mahometanism*: And the State of *Christendom* is in the *Eastern* Parts of it under so much Ignorance, and the greatest Part of the *West* is under so much Corruption, that We must confess the far greatest Part of Mankind has been in all Ages left destitute of the Means of Grace, and great Numbers of Men are born in such Circumstances, that it is morally Impossible that they should not perish in them. If God thus leaves whole Nations in such Darkness and Corruption, and freely chuses others to communicate the Knowledge of Himself to them, then We need not Wonder that he holds the same Method with Individuals, that he doth with whole Bodies: For, the rejecting of whole Nations by the Lump for so many Ages, is more hard to be accounted for by us than the selecting of a few, and the leaving others in that State of Ignorance and Brutality *. But it becomes no Man to quarrel with God, and impeach Him on His other Attributes, because He will exercise His Sovereignty, when we are both assured by the sacred Oracles, and see it with our Eyes in the Course of His Providence, that *His Judgments are unsearchable and His Ways past finding out*.

III. There lyes no Just Objection from this Doctrine against the Holiness, Justice or Sincerity of God. *First*, not against His *Holiness*. He has given Men Holy Laws, he forces none to transgress them. 'Tis true they cannot keep them without his Grace, but is God a Debtor of that to any Man? *Who has first given unto Him, and it shall be recompenced?* *Secondly*, Not against his *Justice*: For he damns no Man but for Sin, nor does he damn one repenting Sinner and save another; but he damns all Impenitents and saves all Penitents without Respect of Persons. 'Tis true he gives Repentance to some which he denies to others; but that is an Act of his *Grace*, upon which his *Justice* can no more be quarrelled,

C c 2

than

* See Bp. Burnet on the XXXIX. Art. p. 154.

than for his giving the Means of Grace to *Christians*, which he has denyed to *Pagans*. Plainly, he created our first Parents Perfect and Upright, he gave them a Power to stand, he did not force them to fall; yet he permitted them to do so through the Freedom of their own Will to which they were left. By their Fall their whole Posterity became at once Guilty and Corrupt, just as a Leprous Parent begets a Leprous Child, and a Rebel Father forfeits the Estate, not only for himself, but for all his Posterity that are, by the meer Strength of Nature, to descend from him, unless they be restored by the Prince's Grace. If when God found all Mankind in this Condition, and from all Eternity foresaw that, by his Permission, they would throw themselves into it; Where is the Injustice in chusing some of them as Vessels of Mercy; and passing by others, leaving them to inherit the Choice which their First Parents or themselves or Both had made for them; and then reproaching them to Damnation for their Sins? Where is there any Thing of Injustice in all this? Nay, Is there not here a most Glorious Scene opened, wherein at once Justice is magnified, and Mercy gratified; and both Love and Reverence secured to the Divine Majesty? And it is upon this Consideration that We find the Apostle *satisfying* the Objection which formerly we heard him *silencing*. *What if God, willing to shew his Wrath, and to make his Power known, endured with much Long-suffering the Vessels of Wrath fitted to Destruction: And that he might make known the Riches of his Glory on the Vessels of Mercy, which he had afore prepared unto Glory.* Rom. IX. 22. 23. *Thirdly*, Not against his *Sincerity*. For, why may not God *require* Obedience from the Elect, when his very *Requiring* it is one of the Means by which he determines them to it. Why may not he *threaten* them with Damnation in Case of Disobedience, when the *Threatning* is the Mean appointed for scarring them from it. Is there any Thing here but the Use of a most *Rational* Mean for compassing a most *Holy* End? Is it any Objection against Providence that the Sun is suffered to shine and the Rain to fall on the Tares as well as the Wheat growing together in the same Common Field, tho' the first are to be burned, the latter to be gathered into the Barn? As little Objection is it in this Case, that, while the Elect and Reprobate live mixed together in the visible Church, the *Exhortations* of the Gospel are directed; and the *Offers* of

Life

Life and Salvation made in a general Stile. And, to call this *Disimulation* and a *Cruel and Disingenuous Procedure*, as Mr. Rhind does p. 129, when it is so easie to be accounted for by Reason even upon the Presbyterian *Hypothesis*, was the most Presumptuous Blasphemy.

IV. The said Presbyterian Doctrine is no way contrary to the Design of Revelation, nor to any one Testimony of Scripture. *First*, it is no way contrary to the Design of Revelation: And Mr. Rhind's Medium, for proving that it is, discovers either a most vicious Mind, or a most Prodigious Ignorance of the Controversy. 'According to this Doctrine saith He, p. 130. our Faith and Obedience cannot make our case better nor Worse; it being unalterably fixed by a Prior Will, *Without Regard to either*. Was it Malice or Mistake made him talk at this Rate? Does not the Apostle teach * that *God has chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit and Belief of the Truth*? Did ever any Presbyterian teach otherwise? Do they ever separate 'twixt the End and the Means? Don't they constantly affirm that Holiness and Happiness, Sin and Misery are linked together, as in the Nature of the Thing, so also in the Decree of God? To assert then, that the Doctrine of the Decrees supposeth God to admit to Heaven, and dispatch to Hell *without Respect* either to Faith and Obedience on the one Hand, or Infidelity and Impenitence on the other, was to bid a Defiance both to Modesty and Truth. *Secondly*, It is not contrary to any Testimony of Scripture. Mr. Rhind instances two. The first is 1 Tim. II. 4. *That God wou'd have all Men to be saved*. But, were that to be understood of God's Secret Will, pray how cou'd any Man be lost; *For who hath resisted his Will*? The Counsel of the Lord standeth fast, and the Thoughts of his Heart to all Generations †. The meaning of the Place then is obvious viz. That we should pray for Kings and all that are in Authority as well as for others, because there is no rank or Order of Men whose Faith and Obedience he will not accept of, and upon it save them at the last; In Token whereof he has given them his revealed Will which commands all Men everywhere to repent; And 'tis with respect to this, that he is said to will that they should be saved, and

and not with respect to any uncertain hovering Purpose to be determined by the Creature, which is a Thing inconsistent with the Perfection of his Nature. The other Scripture is *Mark XVI. 16.* *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.* ‘ Which, saith he, plainly supposeth, that a Man ‘ may or may not believe. But this is manifestly false. The Design of the Text is not to shew what Man *may* or *may not* do, but to express the Connexion there is ‘twixt Faith and Salvation, Infidelity and Damnation. Faith is not of the Growth of our own Nature or Will, but is the Effect of the Operation of the Spirit of God; and to deny this, as Mr. *Rhind* does all along, is quite to subvert the Gospel. To these two Scriptures he adds p. 131 an Argument which is this. ‘ All to whom the Gospel is preached are obliged to believe that Christ is their Saviour and died for them. But none ‘ can be bound to believe a Lie, therefore Christ most certainly ‘ died for all to whom the Gospel is revealed; and if so, then the ‘ Doctrine, which asserts the Salvability only of a select Few, is demonstratively false. But this Argument stands on a lame Foot. All, to whom the Gospel is preached, are indeed obliged to believe in the general, that Christ died for, and is the Saviour of all that believe; and from thence, if they (with the joint Testimony of God’s Spirit) are conscious to themselves, that they do believe with such a Faith as is necessary to Salvation; They may confidently infer that Christ died for them and is their Saviour; but to believe that Christ died for me in particular, while I make no Conscience of answering the Terms of the Gospel, is to believe without both Warrant and Evidence. The Foundation then of his Argument being false, the whole Frame of it must needs fall to the Ground.

V. I add that this Doctrine has no pernicious Influence on the Christian Life, when it is improved as it ought to be. Mr. *Rhind* expressly asserts, p. 132, that it has, as running People into the most sinfull *Security*, or into the height of *Despair*, beyond the Capacity of a *Calvinist* Casuist to give Check to either. But, in Opposition to Mr. *Rhind*, I affirm with the Church of *England*, in her *XVII. Article*, ‘ That tho’ for Curious and Carnal Persons, lacking the ‘ Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their Eyes the Sentence ‘ of God’s Predestination, is a most Dangerous Dounfall, whereby
the

the Devil doth thrust them either into Desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean Living, no less perillous than Desperation. Yet the Godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of Sweet, Pleasant, and unspeakable Comfort to Godly Persons, and such as feel in themselves the Working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the Works of the Flesh, and their Earthly Members, and drawing up their Mind to High and Heavenly Things, as well, because it doth greatly establish and confirm their Faith of Eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their Love towards God. Thus far the Church of *England*. Besides, 'tis plain from the Nature of the Thing, that the said Doctrine teaches one to think meanly of himself, and to ascribe the Honour of all to God: Which lays in him a deep Foundation for Humility; and that it inclines to secret Prayer, and to a fixed Dependence on God; which naturally both brings his Mind to a good State, and fixes it in it (*v*). And, which confirms all, we see in *Fact* that these that believe that Doctrine, are generally serious and concerned about their Soul, so that the Goodness of their Heart is an Argument of the Rightness of their Head. I don't know if as much can be said of such as go on the contrary System. Sure I am, they are under shrewd Tentations to procrastinate the Work of their Souls: For when the *Scripture* tells one, that all that believe and repent (at what Time soever it be) shall be saved: And Mr. *Rhind* tells him, that he may repent and believe when he will, that he has it in his own Power to do so, without the Assistance of any *uncommon* Grace; if the Man believe both these; I mean, both the *Scriptures* and Mr. *Rhind's* Doctrine; I referr it to any one to say, whether in that Case, Corruption will not incline him to take his Swing in Sin, in hopes that he may have a quiet Hour at Death to dispatch all his Business. But enough of this.

In the Third Place, the next Presbyterian Doctrine which Mr. *Rhind* attacks is that concerning the *Efficacy of Grace*. They teach, saith he p. 135, that God, to Of the *Efficacy* attain his Eternal Purpose, does by an irresistible Force of Grace.

work.

work Grace in the Elect, and at the same Time denys it to the Reprobate. This is horridly False : For they expressly disown all Force Resistible or Irresistible in the Operation of Grace; and teach (x), that tho' the Elect are *effectually* drawn to Christ, yet it is so, as that they come most *freely*, being made *willing* by his Grace. And is it not very easy to conceive how there may be *Efficacy*, yea and insuperable Efficacy too (which the *Presbyterians* own in this Case) without the least Force ? Is it not plain, that the greater Evidence there is for any Truth, and the stronger Motives there are to any Duty, the more Pleasure the Soul feels, and consequently the greater *Freedom* it exercises, in assenting to the one, or complying with the other ? Is this to make Machines of Men ? When a Man tells me, that *two* and *three* make *five*, the Native Evidence of the Proposition commands my Assent. But is there therefore any Force offered to my Understanding ? Is it not very possible for the Spirit of God to set Home the sense of my Danger through sin upon My Conscience so powerfully, that I shall be *necessarily*, tho' without the least Force, determin'd to fall in with the Overtures of the Gospel in order to my Salvation ? And is it not *needfull* that the Spirit of God do act thus; considering how deeply we are immersed in Corruption, blind to Duty, *dead in Trespasses and Sins*, who cannot of our selves so much as think on good Thought ! And does not the scripture assure us that the Spirit of God does act thus; that He *works in us both to will and to do*; that His People shall be *willing in the Day of His Power*; that He *puts His Spirit within us, and causes us to walk in His Statutes* ? But Mr. Rhind cannot away with this Doctrine, it is with him *opposite to Truth, and Destructive of Christian Life*.

First, saith He p. 135. ' it is opposite to Truth. For how can I be ' reasonably commanded to believe and repent, who am supposed to ' have no strength to do either ? How cou'd Christ reasonably bid *Lazarus, Come forth*; or the Lame Man, *Take up thy bed and walk*, when the one was Dead, t'other an absolute Cripple ? Has Mr. Rhind with Presbytry renounced the Gospel too ? Does he believe there is never any secret Efficacy attends the Dispensation thereof ? But, adds he, ' How can that in Propriety of Speech be called my Act, ' which was never elicited by me ? Very Strong ! Because another raised

raised me up, therefore my standing or walking is not my Act! Because, when I was lying Dead in Sin, the Spirit of God quickened me to repent and believe; therefore, *repenting* and *believing*, when I am quickened, is not my Act! Because Christ *draws* me, therefore it is not *I* that run, notwithstanding he has *made me willing* to it! Was this to Argue?

Secondly. 'It is, *saith* he p. 136, destructive of Christian Life, in 'that it excuses the greatest Villanies under Pretence of exalting 'the free Grace of God, and discourages all the good Endeavours 'that should be used. To make this good, he introduces a *Calvinist* Teacher endeavouring (but without Possibility of Success) to reclaim a *Debauchè* of the Party. Mr. Rhind has acted the *Debauchè*, furnishing him with Arguments, formed, as he imagines, upon the Presbyterian *Hypothesis*. I shall crave leave to act the *Calvinist Teacher*; and dare promise, tho' not actually to convert the *Debauchè*, that is God's Work, yet to satisfy his Objections even by the *Presbyterian* Scheme of Principles. The *Dialogue* then stands thus.

Dialogue between a Calvinist Teacher, and a Debauchè of the Party.

Calv. Sir, I find you still going on in a Course of *Debauchery*; I have often told you before, and now tell you once more, that unless you reform you'll go to Hell.

Deb. Alas, Sir, you know, that I cannot effectually reform without irresistible Grace, and I am not to blame that I am not yet Passive of it. p. 136.

Calv. What, Sir! cannot you give over your *Debaucheries*, your Drinking, Cursing, Swearing, Whoreing, Gameing, without irresistible Grace? Did I ever teach you so? Have not I always told you, that a Man may reform these Vices without *Special* Grace? How can you say, that *you* are not to blame that you have not yet been Passive of Grace? Have you used the Means, cultivate your Natural Faculties, improved your Reason? When you have not

D d

been

been faithfull in that which is less, why should God commit to your Trust that which is more? Are not *you* then to blame? That which God has already given you was sufficient whereupon to have either prevented or broken off a Course of *Debauchery*; nay, as I have often told you before, you might have gone, upon the meer Strength of Nature, as far as ever a *Plato* or *Seneca* went.

Deb. True, Sir. But even then my best Actions, without this Grace, wou'd be but so many *Splendid Sins*. p. 137.

Calv. Right. But is it not better that you should be guilty only of these *Splendid Sins*; that is, Actions which, tho' not fully acceptable with God through want of a right Principle and Christian Motive; yet have not only the Colour, but Matter too, of Virtue; and make one that he is *not far from the Kingdom of God*; were not this better, I say, than that you should swill (as you do) in Vice and Sensuality; and make your self the Reproach of Humane Nature, and the Scandal of the Town?

Deb. But, Sir, the Reformation which you preach can be of *no Advantage* to my *Soul* without Grace; and seeing this Grace is not in my Power, I hope you will, and it is but *reasonable* you shou'd, allow me to *gratifie* the *Body*, seeing the contrary cannot in the least advance the Interest of my *Soul*. *ibid.*

Calv. What do I hear! Wou'd such a Reformation be of *no Advantage* to your *Soul*? Not in the least advance the Interest thereof? Where did you learn such Divinity? Are there no Degrees in Guilt? And is it not a huge Advantage to want the least Degree thereof; seeing your Punishment in *Hell* must rise in Proportion thereto, in Case you repent not: Or the Stings and Remorse of your Conscience *here*, even suppose you do? And is the unfinckere and transitory Pleasure of Sin to be laid in the Ballance with either of these, even in Point of plain Reason? But, abstracting from the Advantage such a Reformation wou'd be of to the *Soul*, is it *reasonable* I shou'd allow you to *gratifie* the *Body* with Vice? Vice I say, whose Pleasures are hollow in the present Enjoyment, and will at long run ruin your *Body*, and all your temporal Interest. Wheneven that Virtue, which you may attain to by Strength of Reason, carries its own Reward in its Bosom; and recommends it self both by the much more manly Pleasures which attend its Exercise

ercise, and the solid Advantages that *follow* upon it even in this Life. Don't you see the *Drunkard* for the most part reduced to Poverty, while the *Sober Man* by good Manadgment and industrious Frugality enjoys a comfortable Competency? Have not you observed the *first* seized with burning Fevers? or surprized with a sudden Death, drowning in his own Vomit; while the *other* has enjoyed a healthfull and vigorous Age? Did you never see the Ruins of *Lust* in the old *Adulterer*; his weak Limbs, and meagre Carcase, and his Body as loathsome as his Name? Have you not observed what Confusion, Jealousies, Discords and Misunderstandings such leud Persons have begot both in their own and their Neighbour's Family? Has not this one Sin ruined some of the greatest Families, and left the fairest Estates without Heirs? While on the other Hand the chast and continent Person has retained a healthfull Body, a savoury Name, and left a numerous Posterity behind him. So that, upon the whole, your reforming from your open *Debaucheries* is in your Power by the Strength of Nature: And is the most preferable Course in Point of Reason.

Deb. But I am uncertain whether I be one of the Elect or Reprobate. *Ibid.*

Calv. No wonder truly; seeing you still continue in your *Debaucheries*: For, the *Sanctification of the Spirit*, and the *Belief of the Truth* are both the Fruits and Evidences of Election; of which no Man can possibly be certain *without* them; nor, in an ordinary Way, but *by* them.

Deb. But my Practice depends upon my Knowledge of this. For if I be one of the *Elect*, I will sometime, were it only at the Hour of Death, be determined by this Grace, and so will certainly be saved, notwithstanding the Leudness of my bygone Life; and if I be not, why should I abstain from Sin, when an Abstinence, without Grace, can be of no use to me? And this Grace I cannot command: And if I be none of the *Elect*, I am not to expect it: Therefore, seeing I am to forfeit the Joys of Heaven, which is my Misfortune not my Fault, you must excuse me if I do not lose the Pleasures of Sin, which I may so freely enjoy? *Ibid.*

Calv. Pray Sir, does either Reason or Scripture dictate such a Conduct to you? Or are these rational Inferences from the Do-

Grines of *Election* and *Grace* which you have been taught? Is it not necessary in all Sciences to begin at what is most easie and obvious, and thence to come to the Knowledge and Certainty of what is more difficult? Are you not sensible that (besides all the other Flaws in your Reasoning, such as, *the uselessness of an Abstinence from Sin*, which I have already discoursed) you begin at the wrong End? Whether you are of the Elect or not is a secret with God; not otherwise to be discovered by you, but by the Fruit of it, I mean, Holiness in Heart and Life. This God has enjoined in his *revealed* Will; and therefore it is your Duty to Study and endeavour it, without fear of any latent Decree lying against you: And if you attain to it, you may then most certainly infer from it both your Election and Salvation. But you will needs invert God's Order, you must needs first know his *secret* Will, before you apply your self to obey his *revealed* Will; whereas he has enjoined you to obey his *revealed* Will; and thence to gather his *secret* Will concerning your self. For shame, Sir, make better use of your Reason. Apply your self to your Duty which you are sure you ought to do; and don't expect to be saved in the Neglect of it upon the Account of your *Election*; when God has expressly said that *he has chosen us that we should be Holy*. Neither be discouraged from it with the Apprehension of your *Reprobation*; seeing you own your self to be *uncertain* of it: For who would baulk *certain* Duty for *uncertain* Danger? No rational Man would reason so weakly about his temporal Affairs.

Deb. But, Sir, whether I be of the Elect or Reprobate, there is no doing of my Duty, should I never so much endeavour it without Grace; and therefore whether I will or not, I *must continue as I am* untill it shall please God to determine me by his irresistible Power. *Ibid.*

Calv. How Sir! May not ye do more than ye do? Have not I shewn you how far you may go upon Strength of Nature or common Grace? What necessity then are you under to *continue as you are*? Besides, if together with other Means you wou'd pray to God for *eff-ctual* Grace, you shou'd certainly obtain it; if you do not, you are inexcusable.

Deb. Oh, Sir, what an idle Exhortation is that? For, tell me I beseech

beseech you, is it not the Prayer of Faith which only prevaileth with God? *Ibid.*

Calv. Right. It is so.

Deb. And is not Faith the Effect of his *irresistible* Grace? *Ibid.*

Calv. True. Of his *insuperable* Grace it is: For, as for these Terms of *Resistible* and *Irresistible*, they were first contrived or occasioned by the *Arminians* in this Controversy.

Deb. Well then, if my Prayer be acceptable, I have this Grace, and it is needless to pray for what I have already. p. 138.

Calv. That's a false Inference: For Faith and every other Grace is both preserved and increased by Prayer and other Means to be used by us; tho' it is indeed needless to pray for the *first* Gift of Faith, after I am *sure* that I have it, which, I suppose you are not.

Deb. Well then, if my Prayer be not acceptable, why should I pray for what I am not to obtain? *Ibid.*

Calv. Poor Sophistry. God *commands* you to pray, and that *Command* makes it your *Duty*: And it is while People are in the way of their *Duty* that God ordinarily comes with his *free* Grace; whereas the Neglect of it renders them certainly inexcusable. Up then and be doing. Break off your Course of *Debauchery* which you are under no other Necessity of continuing in, but what the Habit of it has brought upon you; and ply Prayer with all your Might, which you see you are *obliged* to do by virtue of God's Authority. And assure your self that God will not condemn you for what you *cannot*, but for what you *will* not do. Observe these Things I say, and I hope shortly to have a good Account of you. And I heartily pray God it may be so. Adieu

Thus I have allowed the *Debauché* to argue with all the Strength Mr. Rhind cou'd furnish him with from the *Presbyterian* Scheme. And upon the same Scheme I have answered him: And I refer it to the Reader whether, if Corruption don't prevail over Principle, the *Debauché* is not obliged even by the *Presbyterian* Principles to mend his former leud Life, and in a hopefull Way to make a good Christian (if he will be true to his principles) in Spite of all his Objections. Therefore, which was the thing to be proved, the

the *Presbyterian* Doctrine concerning the Efficacy of Grace is not Destructive of *Christian* Life. And I have taken this Pains, and been so large on this Subject; that I might convince all *Debauchés* on the *Presbyterian* Side, who yet I hope are not more numerous than these on the other, that their Leudness is not owing to their Principles, but to their own vitious Inclinations: And I pray God may bless what I have advanced for the reclaiming them.

In the *fourth* Place. The last *Presbyterian* Doctrine which Mr. Rhind impugn is that of *Perseverance*, that the Saints cannot fall away *totally* nor *finally* from the Estate of Grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the End, and will be Eternally saved.

Now, too sad Experience teaches, that even the *Saints* may through the Temptations of Satan, and the World, the Prevalency of Corruption remaining in them, and the Neglect of the Means of their Preservation, fall into grievous Sins: And for a Time continue therein; whereby they incur God's Displeasure, and grieve his Holy Spirit, come to be deprived of some Measure of their Graces and Comforts, have their hearts hardened, and their Consciences wounded, hurt and scandalize others, and bring temporal Judgments upon themselves. All this the *Presbyterians* acknowledge (y). But that they shou'd *totally* and *finally* fall away, the Immutability of the Decree of Election flowing from the free and unchangeable Love of God the Father; the Efficacy of the Merit and Intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit and of the Seed of God within them; and the Nature of the Covenant of Grace will not suffer us to believe.

But Mr. Rhind is of a contrary Mind, and endeavours to disprove this Doctrine from four Arguments. P. 138---148.

I. The Exhortations to *Perseverance*, saith he, the Encouragements promised upon it, and the severe Threatnings in case of *Apostacy* do evidently suppose the Possibility of a Fall. I deny it, they are only Means appointed by God for their *Perseverance*; and do in their own Nature contribute to that End. That cannot be, saith Mr. Rhind: For that were to contradict the Confession of Faith which saies
That

That the Perseverance of the Saints does not depend upon their own Free Will. Strongly argued! Their Perseverance does not depend upon their own Free Will, *Ergo* Exhortations, Encouragements and Threatnings cannot contribute to determine and fix their Will! Our daily Bread comes from God, *Ergo* He cannot require our daily Labour for gaining it! God has infallibly promised that the Saints shall persevere; *Ergo* he must not use rational Means to make them do so! Mr. Rhind it seems must be incurably gone in the *Logicks*.

II. He argues from a Text of Scripture viz. Heb. VI. 5. 6. *It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the Heavenly Gift, and were made Partakers of the Holy Ghost, and of the Powers of the World to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto Repentance.* 'These, He alledges p. 140, are Epithets 'so peculiar to the truly Faithfull, that he challenges us to shew 'where any of them, much less all together, are applyed to any 'other in the Scriptures, and yet such might fall away. A fair Challenge. But then very unhappily, there is not one of these Epithets peculiar to the truly Faithfull. Not one of them but what is found to be applyed to Wicked Men or Hypocrites; yea sometimes they are all applyed together to such. Plainly the Meaning of the Text is, that such as have been convinced of the Truth of the Christian Religion, and have made publick Profession thereof by Baptism; both which are included in the Term *Enlightened*; and thereupon have *tasted of the Heavenly Gift*, that is, have not only been affected with a temporary Joy, as People naturally are upon Changes; but also, which was very frequent in the Apostolick Times, have been blessed with the extraordinary *Charismata*, Miracles, Tongues, Gifts of Healing and the like, expressed in the Text by being made *Partakers of the Holy Ghost, and of the Powers of the World to come*; if, saith the Apostle, such Persons thus privileged shall afterwards apostatize to *Paganism*, their Apostacy so hardens them, and lays waste their Conscience in so dreadfull a Manner, that it is impossible for them to return again by Repentance; nor ought they, as some say, be readmitted to the Peace of the Church. This is the Sense of the Text; but where is there any Thing here *peculiar to the truly Faithfull*, any Thing which notoriously

ously wicked Men or Hypocrites have not been priviledged with? *Balaam* was enlightned, he was the man whose Eyes were open, and who had a Vision of the Almighty. Numb. XXIV. 3. 4. *Simon Magus* believed and was Baptized Acts VIII. 13. The stony-ground-Hearers received the Word with Joy, and yet they had no Root in themselves, and therefore dared but for a while Matth. XIII. 20. 21. And many will say to our Lord at the Last Day, *Have we not prophesied in thy Name? And in thy Name cast out Devils? And in thy Name done many wonderfull Works?* to whom our Lord notwithstanding will profess, not only that He does not know them; but that He never knew them.

III. He argues from Examples viz. the Glorious *Angels* who became incorrigible Devils, the Innocent *Adam* who became a Child of Wrath, *David* who was deliberately guilty of Adultery and Murder, *Solomon* who was guilty of repeated Adultery and Idolatry, *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* who were Guilty of Apostacy and Blasphemy.

As for the two first Examples, the *Angels* and *Adam*, they are impertinent. It is the Perseverance of the Saints under the Covenant of Grace which the Presbyterians affirm, and not of any Creature in its natural State. 'Tis true the best Saints cannot pretend to equal either the *Angels* or *Adam* in Holiness; but it is not upon the Measure of Holiness; but the Immutability of God's Decree, and such other Grounds as I have already mentioned, that the Perseverance of the Saints depends.

As for *David* and *Solomon*, Mr. *Rhind* does not affirm that they fell finally away and were damned; and therefore I need not stay to disprove that they were. The Presbyterians grant that their Grace was not only impaired, but laid asleep for a Time like live Embers raked up under the thick Ashes choaking both the Light and the Heat. But Mr. *Rhind* avers it was totally lost. Let us consider on what Grounds he avers this.

First, As to *David*. And here Mr. *Rhind* falls into a Couple of the most prodigious Blunders I have readily heard. Take his Words. 'If, saith he p. 142, this Commination, viz. that Murderers and Adulterers cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, be not false and delusory, *David* was upon the Commission of these Sins liable to Damnation; and if so, he had certainly fallen from the

‘ the State of Grace; seeing, according to our Adversaries, none who are in that State can be *thus liable*. Thus he. Now, *First*, did ever the Presbyterians teach, that none who are in a State of Grace can be *liable* to Damnation? So far from it, that they teach, that there is not one Man even in a State of Grace, who is not *liable* to Damnation. *Secondly*, Is every one who is *liable* to Damnation fallen from a State of Grace? Why then the most Righteous Man on Earth falls from a State of Grace every Day: For he sinneth every Day, and the least Sin makes him *liable* to Damnation, unless Mr. Rhind will distinguish Sins into *Venial* and *Mortal*. He has another Proof against *David viz.* ‘ That having by his Adultery become one with an Harlot, he must at that Time have been disjoined from Christ according to the Apostle’s Doctrine 1 Cor. VI. 15. *Know ye not that your Bodies are the Members of Christ*----- But God is represented in Scripture as bearing the Bowels of a Father towards his People. Now a Father may have oftimes Cause to be Angry with his Son, and not only to frown upon him, but to chasten him. But to renounce the Relation of a Father and disinherit him is the last Thing he will do. So in this Case, *the thing that David had done displeased the Lord*, yet as God had a Reserve of Kindness for him, as appeared in the Issue: So it is plain that *David* did not *totally* renounce God: And therefore, in his Penitential Psalm on that Occasion, tho’ he prayed indeed that God would *restore unto him the Joy of his Salvation*, which intimates that he was under the Frownings of his Countenance, and Tokens of his Wrath: Yet he does not pray that God would *restore his Holy Spirit unto him*, but that he would *not take it from him*, which is at once an Acknowledgment of his Justice, that he might do it; and yet of his Goodness, that he had not done it.

As for *Solomon*, Mr. Rhind aggravates his Crimes at a mighty Rate and in the burlesque stile; and indeed they were very great; yet it does not become him nor any Man else to be harder upon him than the Spirit of God in the Scriptures has been. The Scripture indeed says, * *That his Heart was not Perfect with the Lord his God*, and that *he went not fully after the Lord*: But no where does it insinuate that ever he fell quite off from Him. Mr. Rhind urges that the plainest Philosophy teacheth that two contrary Habits can-

not lodge at once in the same Subject; And 'tis very true, that in the *most intense* Degree they cannot: But all the Philosophy that ever was heard of teacheth, and Experience convinceth, that in *more remiss* Degrees they may; and that this was *Solomon's Case*, the forecited soft Expressions of the Scripture allow us to believe.

As for *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, the Apostle indeed saies I Tim. 1. 19. 20. *that they had made Shipwrack concerning the Faith*, that is, they had thrown off the Christian Profession: But he does not say that they had made Shipwrack of the Faith; for indeed he never so much as insinuates that ever they had been endued with the genuine Grace of Faith. But, saies Mr. Rhind, 1st, *How cou'd it offend God, or harm them to lose that which was not the true and saving Faith?* It seems then that when a Wicked man openly renounces Christ, it does not, by Mr Rhind's Account, either offend God or harm Himself. This is pretty strange Doctrine. 2^{dly}, saith He, *why should they be delivered unto Satan for renouncing the Faith, if it was not that genuine Grace, when without this (according to our Adversaries) they were already in his Clutches?* Strong Sense! A scandalously wicked Man is in the Clutches of Satan, why then should the Church, in Case of his Obstinacy, by Excommunication declare Him to be so? Is not this mighty judicious Reasoning? 3^{dly}, saith he, *it was the same Faith which Timothy is advised to hold in the 19 verse.* Right. It was the Christian Faith, the Profession whereof they had cast off, but how does it appear that ever they had been *subjectively* possessed of it? 4^{ly} he excepts upon the 5 and 6 ver, where it is said, *Now the End of the Commandment is Charity, out of a pure Heart, and of a good Conscience, and of Faith unfeigned: from which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain Jangling.* But the Original Word ἀποζησαντες, which is rendered *swerved from* properly signifies *not to aim at*; and so it cannot import that these Persons had ever been possessed of the genuine Grace of Faith. Plainly the Meaning of the Text is, that some Preachers aimed not at the great Design of the Gospel, but went out of the Way to a Divinity made up of empty Words. Thus even Dr. Hammond expounds it. But what Relation hath this either to falling or not falling from Grace.

IV. He argues from the Nature of the Thing. *If*, saith he p. 146, *the truly Gracious not only may be, but actually are guilty of very*
we

hainous Sins, which cannot be denied; then either these sins are Offensive to God or they are not. I answer they are Offensive, and thereby God's Displeasure is incurred, and his Holy Spirit grieved, as we have already heard from the Confession of Faith; and therefore Mr. Rhind shews what a wretchedly abandon'd Creature he is, when he represents us as teaching, that the most horrid Impieties are not such when committed by the Saints. But what would he infer from this, that the Sins of the Saints are offensive to God? Why, saith He, if He be angry with Men because of them, they cannot at the same Time be in His Favour; and if we have lost his Favour, they have fallen from his Grace. Monstrous Nonsense! A Father cannot frown upon or correct His Son out of Love! He cannot be Angry with Him unless He disown Him! A Prince cannot be displeased with His Subjects, but He must instantly denounce them Rebels! This is such weak Stuff that I doubt if it can be paralleled.

Thus now I have gone through the Doctrine of the *Decrees* with its *Dependencies* impugned by Mr. Rhind. And tho', I acknowledge, these Doctrines are such as that one cannot have full and adequate Notions of them, the largest Mind being too narrow to comprehend them, the most penetrating Wit to sound all their Depths, and the most indefatigable Study to conquer all the Difficulties that may be charged upon them, any other Way than by submitting our Judgments to the Revelation of God; yet I hope I have made it evident that they are so far from being false; that they are indeed the very Doctrines of the Gospel, and most consistent with a Christian Life. But the Writers of Mr. Rhind's Stamp form to themselves an imaginary Scheme of Chimerical Notions, and having Christened them *Presbyterianism*, they fall a disputing against them; and when they have demolished the Brat of their own Brains, they crow over the conquest as if they had confuted the *Presbyterian* Doctrines. That no Body may be imposed upon by their Misrepresentations; as the Presbyterian's Doctrine may be easily known by their publick *Formula's*, so I shall give a just Representation of the Conduct of their Ministers relating to these Doctrines, which is this.

We never teach our People to take it at first Hand for granted: either that they are of the *Elect*, or that they are of the *Reprobate*, But we teach them *first* to *examine*, and *then* to *conclude*. And in the

the Exercise of this *Examination*, we never teach them to begin at that Question, *Am I elected?* but at these, *Do I believe? Do I repent? Have I a Conversation suitable to the Gospel?* If their Consciences, when thoroughly examined, give a satisfying Answer to these; we bid them from thence conclude their Election, and exhort them to go on in *working out their Salvation with Fear and Trembling*. But if their Consciences bring in a negative Answer upon these Questions, we tell them they are in a most dangerous State; yet we forbid them to conclude themselves *Reprobates*: For we do not think, that in the militant Church the Words *Elect* and *Believer* are of the same Extent: All *Believers* are *Elect*, but all the *Elect* are not as yet *Believers*, tho' they certainly shall be so. Upon this Principle we exhort them to use the Means Reading, Hearing, Meditation, Prayer and the like. And tho' we dare not teach them the Doctrine of Merit, either *de Congruo* or *Condigno*; yet we assure them upon God's Promise, that, in the Use of Means, he will not be wanting to them with his Grace. But if they shall continue to neglect the Means, we assure them that final Impenitency is an Infalible Mark of *Reprobation*, and the Cause of *Damnation*: And that it is presumption to conclude themselves elected when they feel not the Gospel Evidences thereof; telling them in the Words of the Apostle, that *God hath chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit and Belief of the Truth*. And to bring home the Title of *Elect* to themselves, otherwise than upon these Evidences, we dare not teach them.

I hope there is Nothing in all this but what is both agreeable to the Scripture, and tends to promote Holiness. Here then I might put an End to this Subject: But there is something further to be done for humbling the Pride of these Gentlemen who are so full of themselves upon Mr. Rhina's Scheme.

S E C T. II.

Wherein is proved, that the Presbyterian Articles of Faith, impugned by Mr. Rhind, are the same with those of the whole Christian Church.

FOR making this good I assert I. That these Doctrines are the Doctrines of the whole *forreign* Churches that go by the Name of REFORMED: And that, in the Judgment of the highest and most learned *Episcopalians*, neither in these, nor indeed in any Thing else Relating to Doctrine, do they maintain any Thing that is *fundamentally* false. II. That these Doctrines are the Doctrines of those of the *Episcopal* Communion in *Scotland*. III. That they are the Doctrines of the Church of *England*. IV. To compleat all, That the CATHOLICK Church of Christ hath declared these Doctrines to be the Orthodox Faith; and that such as oppose them are worthy of an ANATHEMA. If I shall prove all these Things, and that from uncontested Documents, which I am tolerably sure of doing; I hope it will follow, that these Doctrines can be no just Ground of Separation from the *Presbyterians*; and that such as do separate on the Account of them cannot claim Communion with any Church in the World. Let us try it then.

I. I say that these Doctrines are the Doctrines of the whole *Forreign* Churches which go by the Name of *Reformed*. For proving this I need not appeal to this or the other particular *Divine*. No. I refer the Reader to the *Syntagma Confessionum*, where he may have the *Confessions* of all the Reformed Churches under his View at once. And that they all assert these Doctrines is so evident that no Man ever to this Day denied it; so that I need not insist. But then, to make this Argument compleat; I add, that in the Judgment of the highest and most learned *Episcopalians*, neither in these, nor indeed in any Thing else relating to Doctrine, do they maintain any Thing that is *fundamentally* false. For this, the Testimony of Mr. *Dodwell* will be sufficient. He, in His Book which I have so often before cited,

cited, I mean the *Parænesis ad Exteros*, in order to recommend *Episcopacy* to the *Forreign Churches*, by shewing how much it wou'd conduce to the Good of the Reformation if Bishops were restored, writes thus, ' Were this done, *saihb he* (z) I do not indeed see why Communion might not be held with at least all the *Reformed Churches* : For, ' as for *Socinians*, and *Socinianizing Arminians*, I don't think them ' worthy the Name of *Reformed*. But as to the rest, I see no fundamental Doctrines in which they differ, I mean, which are clearly ' delivered in the Scripture. And that such only can be called *fundamental* Doctrines, the *Reformed* at least are agreed, nor ought any ' Doctrines, which are not fundamental, obstruct Communion with ' other Churches. Thus far Mr *Dodwell*. 'Tis then a plain Case, by His Judgment, that these Doctrines which Mr *Rhind* has quarrelled are not *fundamentally false*, and that none ought to separate from any Communion on the Account of them ; and as little from the Presbyterians in *Scotland* as any. For, I suppose, every Man will own that there is no Society under the Cope of Heaven more free of *Socinianism*, or that favours *Socinianizing Arminians* less than they. I hope then the *first Point* is fairly gained.

II. These Doctrines which Mr *Rhind* has quarrelled are the Doctrines of those of the *Episcopal Communion* in *Scotland*. In all the Revolutions since the Reformation wherein ever *Episcopacy* got the Ascendant, we hear but of one *Confession of Faith* formed by them, and that was in the Assembly at *Aberdeen Anno 1616* in which Archbishop *Spotswood* presided. Now hear some Articles of it.

This Glorious God, from all *Eternity*, out of his Wisdom and Infinite Knowledge decreed all things that were after to be done.

This God, before the Foundation of the World was laid, according to the good Pleasure of His Will for the Praise of the Glory of His Grace did *predestinate* and elect in Christ some Men and Angels unto eternal Felicity, and others He did appoint for eternal Condemnation, according to the Council of His most Free, most Just and most Holy Will. and that to the Praise and Glory of his Justice.

By

[z] Nec sane video cur, id si fieret, cum omnibus, saltem *Reformatis Ecclesijs*, Commercium illud haberi non possit. Nec enim dignos eo nomine puto *Socinianos*, nec qui *Sociniani* habent *Arminianos*. In reliquis *fundamentalia* dogmata nulla video in quibus discrepent, quæ quidem petipere tradamur in scripturis. Nec enim sola *fundamentalia* appellari posse, conveniunt saltem *Reformati*. Nec debent alia dogmata ob stare quo minus cum *Ecclesijs* alijs Communio servetur, præterquam *fundamentalia*. *Parænes. Sect 54. p 247*

By the Fall of *Adam* all His Posterity are so corrupted from their Conception and Nativity, that *none* of them *can* do or will *any* Thing truly acceptable unto God, till they be renewed by the Will and Spirit of God, and by Faith ingrafted in Christ Jesus.

Albeit all Mankind be fallen in *Adam*, yet *only* these who are elected before all Time, are in Time redeemed, restored, raised and quickened again; not of themselves or of their Works; lest any Man should glory, but *only* of the Mercy of God.

We believe, that albeit the Elect of God, through Infirmary and through the Enticements thereof, sin grievously to the Offence of God, yet they cannot *altogether* fall from Grace, but are raised again through the Mercy of God and kepted to Salvation. Thus the *Scotch Episcopal Confession of Faith*.

All this they subscribed with their Hands, confessed with their Mouths, and professed to believe with their Heart, and at the same Time declared the Church of *Scotland* to be *one of the most pure Kirks under Heaven*. What an unaccountable Thing then is it in our *Episcopalians* to object against the Doctrines of their own *Confession of Faith* as *fundamentally* false and pernicious? Have they quite foresworn all Modesty? Will they say that they have altered their *Faith*? If so, let us know when they did it. Let us know where we may find their new *Confession* of it? If these Doctrines are *fundamentally* false and Pernicious, I can never come over to the *Episcopal Side*, nor indeed any Man that regards his Soul: For how well pleased soever I may be with their *Government*, yet their *Doctrines* are damnable. So much for the *Second Point*, which I hope is fairly enough cleared.

III. These Doctrines are the express Doctrines of the Church of *England* in Her XXXIX Articles. I before produced the XIII Article declaring *Works done before the Grace of Christ to have the Nature of Sin*. Two Articles more will be sufficient for my Purpose.

E e 2

ART.

ARTICLE X.

Of Free-Will.

THe Condition of Man after the Fall of *Adam* is such that He *cannot* turn and Prepare Himself by his own Natural Strength and good Works to Faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have *no* power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ *Preventing* us, that we may have a good will, and *working* with us when we have that good will.

ARTICLE XVII.

OF

Predestination and Election.

Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the Foundations of the World were laid) He hath constantly decreed by his Counsel, *secret* to us, to deliver from Curse and Damnation *those* whom He hath chosen in Christ *out of Mankind*, and to bring *them* by Christ unto everlasting Salvation as Vessels made to Honour. Wherefore *they* which be endued with so excellent a Benefit of God, be called according to God's Purpose, by his Spirit working in due Season. *They* through Grace obey the calling, *they* be justified freely, *they* be made Sons of God by Adoption, *they* be made like the Image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ: *They* walk religiously in good Works, and at length by God's Mercy *they* attain to everlasting Felicity.-----

These *Articles* were agreed to in the Year 1562, and are the only authorized Standard to this Day. There are but two Things can be offered to take off the Weight of this heavy Objection *viz.* 1st That the Clergy don't receive them as *Articles of Faith*, but as *Vincula Pacis*; or to use Mr *Rhina's* Words p. 119 where he seems to have designed to anticipate this Objection, that it is only an *Acquiescence*.

esce not an *inward Assent* that is required. I crave Leave to consider this Defence: And if any Man can take off what I am to offer against it, I shall yield that He has answered my whole Book.

In the *first* Place, admitting the *Articles* were designed not for *Articles of Faith*, but to be *Vincula Pacis*, and that it were only an *acquiescence* in, not an *inward Assent* that were required to them; yet how is it consistent with common Honesty in any Clergy-Man of that Communion to Preach, Print, Dispute against and ridicule the Doctrine contained in them? Is that to *acquiesce* in them? *2dly*, If the Doctrines contain'd in these *Articles* are *fundamentally* false and Pernicious, how can any Clergy-Man with a good Conscience promise to *acquiesce* in them? If they are of such a damning Nature, is he not obliged under Pain of Damnation to himself to warn People against them? These *two* Things I have suggested upon Supposition that no more but an *Acquiescence* in them were required. But then I add *3dly*, That that Alledgance is even impudently false. For *first*, the very Title of the *Articles* bears, that they were agreed upon, not only for the *avoiding of the Diversities of Opinions*, but for the *stablishing of Consent touching true Religion*. Secondly, By the XXXVI. Canon 1603 all Bishops are discharged to Ordain, admit or License any so much as to Preach, till such Person acknowledge all and every the *Thirty Nine Articles* to be *agreeable to the Word of God*, and subscribe the same willingly and *ex Animo*. Is it Possible that *Articles* can be *agreeable to the Word of God*, and yet at the same Time *fundamentally false and pernicious*? Is it Possible one can subscribe them as agreeable to the Word of God *ex Animo* without *inward Assent*. Thirdly, By the Statute 13 Eliz. 12. It is ordain'd that every Person, to be admitted to a Benefice with Cure, shall, within two Months after his Induction, publickly read the said *Articles* in the Church whereof he hath the Cure in Common-Prayer Time, with Declaration of his *Assent* thereunto; and if afterward he shall maintain any Doctrine repugnant to the said *Articles*, and shall persist therein, it shall be lawfull for the Bishop to deprive him. So much for the *first* Defence.

The *Second* is, ' That these *Articles* being conceived in such general Words, that they may admit of different literal and grammatical Senses, even when the Senses given are plainly contrary

‘to one another; the *Arminians* may subscribe them with a good Conscience and without any Equivocation (a). But this Defence is yet worse than the former, if worse cou’d be. For 1st, Can there be a greater Scandal upon a Church than to represent her *Articles of Religion* as a Nose of Wax, that may be twisted either to this or the quite contrary Side? Is it Possible to elicit Sound and Orthodox Doctrine, and Doctrine *fundamentally* false and pernicious out of the same Words? *Doth the same Fountain send forth sweet Waters and bitter?* 2^{dly}, Dr. Sacheverell most justly reckons them (b) *False Brethren* who expound any of these *Articles of Faith* in such a loose and vagrant Way as may sute them as well to a *Mahometans* as a *Christian’s* Creed. 3^{dly}, The *Calvinistick* Sense (as it is commonly called) was the only Sense designed in these *Articles*: For, the Framers of them were *Calvinists* themselves*; and therefore ’tis never to be thought they wou’d frame them so as to be Capable of any other Meaning. For pray what cou’d be the Use or Effect of an Acknowledgment of, or Subscription to them on that Supposition. 4^{thly}, The Church of *England* has loudly proclaimed to the World, that She owns these *Articles* only in the *Calvinistick* Sense: And till *Laud* the British *Herostratus* began to set the Nations on Fire, the Church of *England* still prosecuted those that impugned that Sense of them; And the Noble Lord *Falkland* in his forecited Speech tells us, that the contrary Doctrines had not been oftner preached than Recanted. Plainly, the *English Universities*, the Supreme *Ecclesiastical Governours* of the Church, the Court, and the *Delegates* to Forreign Synods have all declared for these *Calvinistick* Doctrines, and asserted them to be the Doctrines of the Church of *England*.

First I say the *English Universities* have done so. In the year 1595 one Mr Barret of *Caius College* in *Cambridge* preaching in the University Church called *St Maries* adventured on an Invective against the Doctrines of *Predestination* and *Perseverance*. This Sermon, tho’ preached in *Latine*, and which therefore cou’d not much affect the *Vulgar*; yet instantly gave the Alarm to the University. The heads

[a] See *Burner’s* Expos. P. 8.

[b] *Burnet* Ubi Supra p. 151. 152.

[c] Sermon on False Brethren. p. [mih] 11. 12.

heads of the Several Houses viz. Dr. Some, Dr. Duport, Dr. Goad Dr. Tindall, Dr. Whitakers, Dr. Barwell, Dr. Jegom, Dr. Preston, Mr. Chadderton, and Mr. Clayton presently met upon it, and upon Mature Deliberation and Advice, by their unanimous Vote adjudged Mr. Barret to recant his Assertions as false, erroneous and manifestly repugnant to the Religion received and established in the Church of England by publick and lawful Authority. This was a very bitter Pill to Mr Barret; yet either his Stomach or His Conscience prevailed with Him to give it Throat. Accordingly, upon the 10th of May in the said Year, He appeared in the *University Church* where he had offended, and made a fair *Recantation*. The Sermon is still extant in Print, and I shall beg Leave to give one Note of it. ‘ These Words, saith ‘ He, escaped Me, viz. *As for those that are not saved, I do most ‘ strongly believe, and do freely protest that I am so perswaded against Cal- ‘ vin, Peter Martyr, and the rest, that Sin is the true, proper, and first Cause ‘ of Reprobation.* But now being better instructed; I say, that the ‘ Reprobation of the Wicked is from everlasting, and that that Say- ‘ ing of *Augustine to Simplician* is most true viz. *If Sin were the Cause ‘ of Reprobation, then no Man should be elected, because God doth foreknow ‘ all Men to be defiled with it.* And (that I may speak freely) I am ‘ of the same Mind; and do believe concerning the Doctrine of E- ‘ lection and Reprobation, as the Church of *England* believeth and ‘ teacheth in the Book of the *Articles of Faith*, in the Article of Pre- ‘ destination.--- And I acknowledg, that by the Vertue of the Prayer ‘ of Christ, every true Believer is so stayed up, that his Faith cannot ‘ fail.--- So that He which once hath this Faith shall ever have it. Thus Mr Barret. The whole Sermon is worthy Mr Rhind’s perusal: For I have the Charity to wish that He may one Day have Use for it.

Secondly, The Supream Ecclesiastical Governours of the Church have declared yet more positively for these Doctrines. Upon the 20th of November in the said Year 1595 they met at *Lambeth* and framed the famous Nine *Lambeth Articles*, which are as follows

The *Nine* Assertions or Articles of *Lambbeth*, composed and agreed upon at *Lambbeth* House on the 20 Day of *November*, in the yeere of our Lord 1595 by *John* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Richard* Bishop of *London*, *Richard* elect Bishop of *Bangor*, and fundry other Reverend and Learned Divines there present.

1. GOD from Eternity hath Predestinated *certain* Men unto Life; *certain* Men he hath Reprobated unto Death.
 2. The moving or efficient Cause of Predestination unto Life, is not the Foresight of Faith, or of Perseverance, or of good Works, or of *any* Thing that is in the Persons Predestinated, but *only* in the Will of the well pleased God.
 3. There is a *definite* and *certain* Number of the Predestinate which can neither be Augmented nor diminished.
 4. Those who are not Predestinated to Salvation shall be *necessarily* Damned for their sins.
 5. A true, living and justifying Faith and the Spirit of God justifying is not extinguished, it falleth not away, it vanisheth not away in the Elect either *finally* or *totally*.
 6. A Man truly faithfull, that is, such a one who is endued with a justifying Faith, is certain with the full Assurance of Faith, of the Remission of his Sins, and of his Everlasting Salvation by Christ.
 7. Saving Grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to *all* Men by which they may be saved if they will.
 8. No Man *can* come unto Christ, unless it shall be given unto Him, and unless the Father shall draw him: And all Men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son.
 9. It is not in the Will or Power of every one to be saved.
- Thus far the *Lambeth* Articles. And this was as plain going to Work as one cou'd wish.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, The Court was not behind with the Church. When afterwards *Arminianism* prevailed in the *United Provinces*, and had caused terrible Convulsions, K. James VI was aware of the Danger the *British* Dominions were in. He was a Prince very well seen in the *Roman* Classics, and no doubt had read the

----- Jam proximus ardet

Ualegon.....

And therefore thought it reasonable to bestir Himself to prevent the spreading of the Flame. For this Purpose He sent over his Ambassador Sir *Dudly Carlton* to perswade the *States* to provide some Remedy and to smother the Sparks which might set Him on Fire. Sir *Dudly* upon the 6 of *October* 1617 attended their *High-Mightinesses* assembled at the *Hague*, and delivered Himself in a most elaborate Speech, wherein He declares the Doctrine impugned by *Arminius* to be the true and ancient Doctrine, and to have been received and authorized by the common Consent of all the Reformed Churches; and that the *Schism* which prevail'd within the Church, and the *Faction* in the State were both owing to *Arminius*. I hope none will deny that Sir *Dudly* had His Great Master's Allowance for saying all this (c). And upon the whole He solicits them to call a *Synod* for determining the controverted Points.

Fourthly, The *English Delegates* to foreign Synods, have declared the same Way. Upon the foresaid Solicitation the Synod of *Dordrecht*, and was assisted by Divines from the Church of *England*: And in the said Synod such Conclusions were made upon the five *Articles*, as I need not tell any Body, are the very same with the Doctrines contain'd in the *Westminster* Confession, maintained by the *Scots* Presbyterians, and now impugned by Mr *Rhind* and the Men of his *Kidney* (d). Somewhile after the Return of these Delegates from the Synod, they were attacked by a certain Scribler on their Conduct and the Doctrinal Conclusions they had gone in to. They thought it necessary to defend themselves, and accordingly wrote A JOINT ATTESTATION (e), whereof take the last Words. 'Whatsoever there was assented unto and subscribed by us concerning the five *Articles* either in the Joint Synodical Judgment, or in our particular

[c] See the Speech it self set forth by Authority, London printed by William Jones. 1618. [d] Vide A^{sa} Synod. Dordrac, (e) London printed by M. Fitcher.

particular Collegiate Suffrage (styled in the Acts of the Synod *Theologorum Magnæ Britannia Sententia*, and at large extant there) is not only warrantable by the Holy Scriptures, but also conformable to the received Doctrine of our said venerable Mother. Which we are ready to maintain, and justify against all Gainsayers, whensoever we shall be thereunto called by lawfull Authority. *Ita attestamus.*

GEORGIUS Ciceſtrienſis Episcopuſ

JOHANNES Sarisburienſis Episcopuſ.

Gualteruſ Balcanquall Decan. Roſſ.

Samuel Ward Pub. Profefs. Theol. in Acad. Cant. & Coll. Sid. Praefect.

Thomas Goad Sacrae Theol. Doctor.

I hope all this is more than ſufficient to prove that the Doctrines impugned by Mr. Rhind, as *fundamentally false and pernicious*, are the Doctrines of the Church of England, and that they are not only *Articles of Peace*, but *Articles of Faith too*. Think then what a wiſe Part He has acted in ſeparating from the *Presbyterians* upon the Account of theſe Articles, and joining the Church of England, which has expreſſly declared ſuch as affirm them to be in any Part erroneous to be Excommunicated *ipſo Facto* (*f*). So much for the Church of England.

IV. Theſe Doctrines are the Doctrines of the *Catholick Church* of Chriſt, which has alſo declared, that ſuch as oppoſe them are worthy of an *Anathema*. What Method ſhall I take to prove this? Shall I go through the ſeveral Authors in the ſeveral Ages? That were too tedious. But, which will be equally ſufficient, I ſhall prove it from the Account of one who was *Episcopalian* Himſelf, a *Scots* Man too, and who was inferiour to none in Theological Abilities, and is held in the greateſt Veneration by all of the *Episcopal* Communion. The Perſon I mean, is Dr *John Forbes* a *Corſe* Divinity Profeſſor at *Aberdeen*, I ſhall prove it from His *Inſtructiones Hiſtorico Theologicae*, a Work, which, to give Biſhop *Burnet*'s Character of it (*g*), ' If He had been ſuffered to enjoy the Privacies of His Retirement and Study to give us the *Second Volume*, had been the greateſt Treasure of Theological Learning that perhaps the World has yet ſeen. The whole *Eight Book* of the foreſaid Work is written on Purpoſe, to ſhew that theſe Doctrines, which Mr. Rhind has impugned, were the Doctrines

Doctrines of the *Catholick Church* of Christ, and to answer the Objections of the *Palagians* and *Semi-Pelagians* against them; which Objections are the very same with those Mr. Rhind has advanced. He has comprehended the Sum of the Controversy in the XII Chapter of his said VIII Book in *seven* Questions, in which he runs the Difference betwixt the Faith of the *Catholick Church* and the Opinions of the foresaid *Hereticks*. These Questions will set the whole Matter in a true Light, and they are as follows

1. *Quest.* Whether are the foreseen good Things of those who are Elected, their Will and Faith and good Works and Perseverance in them, or any of these Things the Cause for which they are Elected, or a Condition prerequisite in those that were to be Elected? Or whether all those Things in the Elect are the Effects of Election and Predestination? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed the first, and denied the latter. But the CATHOLICKS denied the first and affirmed the latter.

2. *Q.* Whether is not the Number of the Elect and of Men Predestinated by God to Grace and Glory from Eternity, definite and determined: So that of them none shall perish, and besides them none shall be saved? The *Semi-Pelagians* denied it. The CATHOLICKS affirmed it.

3. *Q.* Whether hath God from Eternity Predestinated some to Evil? The *Semi Pelagians* utterly deny that any Man was Predestinated either to Sin or to Destruction. The CATHOLICKS distinguished, and denied that any Man was Predestinated to Sin, but affirmed that they were Predestinated to Punishment.

4. *Q.* Whether of the Reprobate did God find the Demerits more and worse than of those whom he Elected; and therefore Reprobated the former and Predestinated them to Destruction, and Elected the latter and Predestinated them to Life Eternal? Or whether he did not find them both equal in their Demerits and worthy of eternal Death? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed the first. The CATHOLICKS affirmed the latter.

5. *Q.* Whether, of this Difference or Discrimination whereby some are Predestinated to Life Eternal, there be any other Cause assigned in the Scripture, besides the most free Will of God, who hath Mercy upon whom He will have Mercy, and hardneth whom He will;

will; and if it be *Lawfull* for us to search for *any* other Cause? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed it. The CATHOLICKS denied it.

6. Q. Whether does this Doctrine of the CATHOLICKS attribute either *Injustice* or *Cruelty* to God, or render Exhortations, Prayers and the Study of Piety useles to Men? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed it. The CATHOLICKS denied it.

7. Q. Whether, supposing this Doctrine of the CATHOLICKS true, is it expedient to Preach it openly and in earnest to the people? The *Semi Pelagians* denied it. But the CATHOLICKS affirmed that it was to be preached openly and in earnest, yet prudently and seasonably as all Divine Mysteries ought to be, and with a right dividing of the Word of Truth.

Thus far that great Man. And in confirming these *Catholic* Doctrines He employs the rest of the said Book: And does it mainly from the Testimonies of the Fathers, in which no Man was better seen. And, to crown all, in the IV Chapter of the said VIII Book He declares, that the contrary Doctrines were, by *Maxentius*, *Petrus Diaconus* and the whole *eastern* Churches with him: By *Fulgentius* and the *African* Bishops: And by the European *Western* Churches, Judged HERETICAL, destructively alien from the CATHOLICK Sense, and worthy of an ANATHEMA in case of Obstinacy in them.

And now what melancholy Reflections must Mr *Rhind* make, when he considers that, as by the former Part of his Book he made Himself a *Schismatick* so by this part of it, he has made himself a most gross *Heretick*? When he considers that Mr *Dodwell* himself has given him the Lye, and that the whole *Forreign* Reformed Churches, our *Scotch* Episcopals, the Church of *England*, and the *Catholic* Church of Christ have all of 'em declared for these Doctrines which he has rejected as *fundamentally false and pernicious*: And when he finds himself, by the Judgment of the *Catholic* Church through the world, enrolled amongst the worst of *Hereticks*, pronounced worthy of an ANATHEMA, and standing *de facto* excommunicated by the Church of *England*!

That I may conclude. I have heard indeed (tho' I think it but a *Fable*) of a Protestant Church somewhere on this side *Nova Zembla*; though I cannot now name the precise Bearing of the Place, where
Nothing

Nothing is required in Law to qualify a Clergy-Man, but that He do not openly deny or impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity. Though He does not believe *that*, and tho' He publicly impugn *all* the other Articles of Christianity, it is Nothing. I grant Mr Rhind might serve for a Priest under such a *Constitution*: But how He can be capable to serve as such in *Britain* is more than I understand. But let those who put Him into Orders look to that. I proceed.

C H A P. IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Third Reason for Separating from the Presbyterians viz. that their Worship is chargeable with fundamental Corruptions and Defects as to the Matter, and that it is very Imperfect as to the Manner, is examined. From P. 148, to P. 185.

THIS Mr Rhind asserts p 149. And if it appear he has proved it, I shall own his *Separation* was Just. Imperfections we acknowledge, as I think all Mankind ought to do, even in our best Performances. But *fundamental* Corruptions & Defects we refuse, & want to find them proved against us. In the mean Time, to separate

G g

parate from the *Scots* Worship, because of its *Corruption*; and to go over to the *Engliff* Worshipping as *purer*, looks so very like a Jest, that for my Heart I cannot but smile at it, as I am sure five hundred others have done before Me, and twice as many, 'tis likely, will do after Me.

Mr Rhind essays the Proof of His Charge in two Particulars viz *Prayers* and *Sacraments*. I shall distinctly consider what He has advanced on each.

S E C T. I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Exceptions against the Presbyterian's Prayers are examined, From P. 149 to P. 177.

AGAINST these he excepts *two* Things I. That the *Matter* of them is *Corrupt* and *Defective*. II. That the *Manner* of them is so far from being the best, that it is very *Imperfect*. His Proof of these Exceptions I shall consider in so many *Articles*.

A R T I C L E I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Proofs, That the Matter of the Presbyterians Prayers is Corrupt and Defective, are Considered. From P. 149 to P. 156.

FOR making good this Charge *First*, He argues, that it *must* be so. *Secondly*, He makes an Induction of the Particulars wherein it is so.

First.

First, He argues that it *must* be so. ‘ If, *saieth He* p. 149, their ‘ *Doctrine* be Corrupt, so must their *Worship* be too; because the Doctrines, which are the common Subjects of their *Sermons*, do likewise constitute the Substance of their *Prayers*. The Answer is easie. I have proved in the preceeding *Chapter*, that these Doctrines, which he charges as *Corrupt*, are the Doctrines of the *Catholick Church* of Christ, believed by every Christian, long before the Upstart Sect of the *High Flyers* was heard of in the World. Therefore the *Prayers* which are formed agreeably to these *Doctrines* can not be Corrupt. Suppose now I had been Preaching the Doctrine of *Absolute Election*: After Sermon I break out into a Prayer to this Purpose.

O GOD We thank thee that Thou hast Predestinated Us unto the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ to thy Self, according to the Good pleasure of thy Will, to the Praise and Glory of thy Grace, whereby Thou hast made us accepted in the Beloved; & hast from the Beginning chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the Truth. Thou mightest have designed Us for Vessels of Wrath, as Thou didst the fallen Angels, and then we had been eternally undone without all possible Remedy. There was Nothing in us to move Thee when we lay all together in the general heap of Mankind. It was Thy own *free* Grace and Bounty, that made Thee to take Delight in us, *to chuse us from the Rest*, and to sever us from these many Thousands in the World who shall perish everlastingly. Give us Grace we beseech Thee, that we may give all Diligence to make our Calling and Election sure---?

This Prayer is exactly formed upon the Scheme of the *Irrespective Decrees*. But is there any thing in it which any Christian may not join with? Mr *Rhind* must needs say there is. In the mean Time I must tell him, I was taught it by *Wilkins* Bishop of *Chester* (*h*) who shou’d have known what was Sound what Corrupt Doctrine, at least as well as Mr *Rhind*.

Secondly, He makes an Induction of the particulars wherein the Presbyterian’s *Prayers* are Corrupt or Defective. Which take as follows in *Ten* particulars.

G g 2

I

1. *They pray*, saith He p. 150, *for the Continuance of Presbyterian Government, and bless God for the Extirpation of, and beseech him to preserve this Nation from Prelacy.* But I have already proved that *Presbytry* is of Divine Institution, and that *Prelacy* is without all Scripture Warrant. Therefore such Prayers are to far from being a *Corruption*, that they are a *Duty*, even as much a *Duty* as it is to pray, that *every Plant which our Heavenly Father hath not planted may be rooted up.*

2. *They thank God*, saith he *Ibid*, *for continuing th^e Presbyterian Doctrine.* But this I have proved to be the Doctrine of the Gospel, and believed by all the Christian Church. It were therefore the worst Ingratitude not to thank God for the Continuance of it.

3. *They never omit*, saith he *ibid*, *in their Publick Prayers to ask a Blessing upon the Word that is to be, or has been Preached.* 'Tis true we do so, and let him make his worst of it. And when he gets a new Revelation to prove the Word which we Preach to be *Impious* and *False*, we beg he may let us hear of it.

4. *They bless God*, saith he *ibid*, *for, and entreat him to continue the Purity of their Worship.* 'Tis true we do so, and I hope God shall hear us. But it was too soon for him to *assert* it to be *Corrupt*, before he had *proved* it to be so. This is the Thing they call *Begging the Question*, or, which is worse, *proving a Thing by it Self.* The Presbyterian Worship is *Corrupt*, because it is *Corrupt!* A very handsome Way of Discoursing, and no doubt very convincing!

5. *They pray*, saith he p. 151, *that God may stop the Progress of the English Liturgy.* Ans. *Amen*, even so be it. But why cou'd not Mr. Rhind join in such a Prayer? Why, he cou'd not do it *without offending God, it being the most excellent of all others.* I shall not say what it may be in its *Nature*, but sure I am it has not proved such in its *Consequences*: For, since ever there were *Liturgies* in the World, never any of 'em, no not all of 'em together have occasioned so much Strife and Division, so much War and Blood-shed, as that has done. But he gives another Reason why he could not join in such a Prayer, which is indeed a very notable one. I could not do it, saith he, *without Treason against the Queen, it being that*
which

which her Majesty Practises, and has authorized (tolerated he shou'd have said) the Exercise of, to those of the Episcopal Perswasion in Scotland. Now I ask. 1st, When was the Law made which makes it *Treason* to pray against the Progress of the *English* Liturgy. I don't think there is any Thing *Treason*, but what the Law has declared to be such. Pray, Good Mr. Rhind, cite the Law in your next, that we may be aware of our Danger. 2^{dly}, May not one with a very good Conscience both pray against and practise contrary to what the Prince practises. I suppose the Apostle *Paul* did both in his Time, and I suppose the Church of *England* Her self did so in the Time of the late K. *James*. Mr. *Hobbes* indeed was a very Learned Man who made the King's Conscience the Standard for the Consciences of all his Subjects, just as the great Clock rules all the lesser Clocks in Town; yet that Gentleman's Principles have not been always well spoken of: But it seems Mr. *Rhind* intends to revive them. 3^{dly}, Has not her Majesty and the *Parliament* Authorized the *Presbyterian* Government and Worship? And yet do not the *Episcopal* Clergy in their Conventicles every Day both pray and preach against the same, and that without any Fear of *Treason*? 4^{thly}, If the *Scots* Episcopal Ministers are so chary of *Treason* against the Queen, why don't they so much as pray for her? Why do they skip over that part of the *Liturgy* which is designed for Her? 'Tis notourly known that the Generality of 'em do this.

6. *They pray*, saith he *ibid*, for a Blessing upon their Kirk Judicatories in the Exercise of their Discipline, which, in many Instances, I knew to be scandalously partial, and highly Unjust. Well. Let us hear one of these Instances? No. He may perhaps give you that in the next Edition. But his Business in this was to *Assert*. Mr. *Rhind* pretends to have gone over to the Church of *England*. What is the Character of Her Ecclesiastical Courts? It wou'd perhaps be thought ill-Nature in Me to give one; but let us hear the Noble Historian *Clarendon* who has saved my Pains to purpose. 'I never yet, saith He (i), spoke with one Clergy Man, who hath had the Experience of both Litigations, that hath not ingenuously confessed

' fessed, he had rather, in respect of his Trouble, charge, and Satisfaction to his Understanding, have *three* Suits depending in *Westminster Hall*, than *one* in the *Arches*, or any Ecclesiastical Court. Now tho' Mr. Rhind cou'd not pray for a Blessing on the *Kirk* Judicatories, yet may he not, after this, with great Freedom pray for one upon the *Church* Judicatories? I'm sure they have much need of Prayers.

7. *They do not*, saies he p. 151, 152, *pray for the Forgiveness of their Enemies*. And he is so high upon this, that he asserts, *During the 22 Years I was among them, I don't Remember that ever I heard one of them (and I have heard some Hundreds) press it as a Duty, or once offer it a Petition to Almighty God*. I wish Mr Rhind had given us some better Testimony than his own; But seeing he has contented himself with it, I think it may be enough to lay Mine in the Ballance against it: But then I shall qualifie it, that it may be enquired into. I have very seldom Occasion to hear others preach. I am now writing this upon the *Eleventh* day of *November* 1713. The last Sermon I heard preached by another was upon *Thursday* the 22 of *October* last. It was preached by Mr *Alexander Muir* Minister of *Rutherglen* in the *High Church* of *Glasgow* in that Part of it commonly called the *Inner-Kirk* before a Numerous Audience upon *Rev. III. 15. 16*. I declare I never conferred with him upon the Subject of *Forgiveness of Enemies*, either before or since; and that he knows Nothing of my intending to publish this Passage. He is known to be a Zealous *Presbyterian*, and always was so. And now after all these Circumstances I declare, and I appeal to the Audience for the Verity of it, that I heard him after Sermon pray in Terms *That God would forgive our Enemies*. This I hope is some better than Mr Rhind's Negative, and I pitched on this Instance, only because it was at the last Sermon I heard. For tho' as I said, I have rarely Occasion to hear Sermon from others, yet when ever I chance to be assistant at the Communion any where, I always hear *all Persons having Malice* solemnly debarred the Lord's Table, and solemn Prayer put up to God for the *Forgiveness of Enemies*. But enough of this, we may possibly hear more of it afterwards.

8. *They pray*, saith he p. 152, *for the Destruction of their Enemies*. How! Of their *Personal* Enemies? If so, 'tis a very great Crime; and we want

want to have the Criminals named, and the Vouchers adduced. Has he done this? No. But, saith he, *I am ready to do it*. Was he in so great haste that he cou'd not stay to give so much as *one* Instance? Gentlemen of the *Episcopal* Perswasion who have adopted and cherished this Book of Mr *Rhind's*, I appeal to you upon your Honour, Sense and Conscience, whether this was a rational Way of Writing; and whether it is not scandalous in the last Degree to approve of it. 'Tis true, saith Mr *Rhind*, *they pretend to do this, because these against whom they pray, are Enemies to Truth, and Persecutors of its Professors*; Very well. And if that *Pretence* be true, are they not just in doing so? No, saith he, *no Pretence can excuse the Impiety of it*. Strange! Are there not innumerable Precedents for it in Scripture? When God has promised to *consume the Man of Sin with the Spirit of his Mouth, and to destroy him with the Brightness of His coming* II Thess II. 8. Is it not lawfull, nay is it not a Duty to turn this Promise into a Prayer? To come yet a little nearer, did Mr *Rhind* never hear of an Address made by the *Scots* Prelates to the late *K. James*, wherein they prayed that God would give him *the Hearts of his Subjects, and the Necks of his Enemies* (k). Was not this to pray for the Destruction of Enemies in good Earnest? And can any *Pretence* excuse the Impiety of it?

But Mr *Rhind* had a secret powerful Reason for insisting on this Topick, as will appear by his Enlargement on it. He alleges that this Pretence and Practice of the Presbyterians argues the most scandalous Partiality and vilest Hypocrisy. Pray how? 'Why, saith He, at the same Time that they pray for the Destruction of *some*, upon Pretence that they persecute the Servants of God; They immediately offer up their most fervent Addresses for the Prosperity of *others* who are no less Persecutors, and neglect to offer up one Petition for a *third Sort* who have signalized themselves in Behalf of such as suffer for Righteousness Sake. I doubt not but several Readers may want a Key to this fine Harangue, but I believe I can supply them. By the *some*, whose Destruction the Presbyterians pray for, upon Pretence that they persecute the Servants of God, He means the *French King*. By the *others* no less Persecutors, whose prosperity the Presbyterians pray for, He means the House of *Au-*

stria,

fria, the Duke of *Savoy* and such other Popish Confederates in the late War. By the *Third Sort* whom the Presbyterians neglect to pray for, notwithstanding they have signalized themselves in Behalf of such as suffer for Righteousness Sake, he means the King of *Sweden*, who piously gave Diversion to the *Allies* in Behalf of the *French King*: And no doubt the Presbyterians were very Guilty in not praying to God for Success to him in so laudable a Service. And now, Good Reader, you have Mr *Rhind's* heart, and an account of that which, beyond peradventure, he cou'd least of all others digest in the Presbyterian Devotions. His Book bears Date in the *Preface*. 6th December 1712, that is about half a Year e're the Peace was concluded. It was then an Unpardonable Crime in the Presbyterians to pray for the *Queen* and her *Allies*, whereas they shou'd have prayed for the *French King* and his Assistants. I believe there is no Man that knows any thing of the History of *Lewis's* Reign, but knows too, that *Nero*, *Domitian* and *Dioclesian* were Mercifull Princes in Comparifon of him; and therefore such as wou'd alleviate his Tyranny and Persecution by calling the Imputation of it a *Pretence* ought no otherwise to be look'd on than as avowed Enemies to the Reformed Interest. And tho' many in *Britain* and *Ireland* are now bewitched with a Spirit of Infatuation in Favours of that Tyrant, yet I hope they may one Day have their Eyes opened to see both their Wickedness and their Folly. I pray God it be not too late, and at the Expence both of our Religion and Liberties. But now as to the Business of the *Prayers*. How often did Her Majesty declare from the Throne, that the reducing the *French* Power was necessary for securing, not only the Protestant Religion, but the Liberties of *Europe* too? And was it not lawfull to pray for Success to those who joined with Her Majesty in so good a Work? And must not every good Man in the three Nations have been sensible of this? Because the People of Mr *Rhind's* Kidney are content to barter Religion, Liberty, and all the most valuable Interests of Mankind, for the dear Enjoyments of Slavery and Superstition; was it needful that the Rest of the Nation shou'd run mad with them? 'Tis true the House of *Austria*, *Savoy* &c persecuted the Protestants in *Hungary*, *Bohemia*, *Piemont* and perhaps with little less Fury than the *French King* did his Subjects. But it is as true that the Presbyterians prayed for the Persecuted

in

in these Places, and against their Persecutors, so far as concerned the Matter of Religion, in the same Terms that they prayed for the persecuted in *France* and against the *French King*. And 'tis true also they blessed God for any Freedom was procured to the Protestants, whether by the King of *Sueden* or any other. But still they prayed against the *French King*, and so did the Church of *England*. For did not Her Majesty order Forms of prayer and Thanksgiving, to be composed by the Bishops at the Opening and Ending of each Campaign, for Success against him? Nay did not the Clergy by Direction of the *Liturgy* (l) pray every day during the War that God wou'd *abate the pride of their Enemies*, *assuage their Malice*, and **CONFOUND** *their Devices*? And did ever the Presbyterians pray against the *French King* or any Body else in harsher Terms? And is it not the Duty of every good Christian to pray for the Destruction of the Power of one who, besides his bloody Enmity to the Reformed Interest, is notoriously known to be an Oppressor of the Liberties of Mankind? Add to all this, that to my certain Knowledge the Presbyterians usually pray; that, if it be Possible, God wou'd give him Repentance, which I hope is a kinder Office done to him, than to justify his unparalleled Wickedness, as some others do.

9. He Objects p 154. 'That they offer up many *Nonsensical* petitions to God, commit many *Blunders* and *Tautologies*, transgress the most fundamental Rules of *Grammar*, *Rhetorick* and *Logick*. Well, how does he prove all this? You are not to ask that; he CAN do it, and that must stand for as good as if he had done it. But how *can* he do it? Why, 'the Expence of a Shilling, *saieth he*, will procure ' from some short Hand Writer a Copy of one of their Prayers at ' some of their Weekly Lectures in *Edinburgh*, where one wou'd suppose their Men of best Sense did officiate. But why wou'd he hazard his being branded as a *Malicious Slanderer*, rather than go to the Expence of a Shilling? However niggardly he is of his Purse, it seems he is abundantly prodigal of his Fame. Besides, when he has published *one* such Prayer, I hope no Man in his Wits wou'd sustain that as a just Exception against the *whole* Communion. There

H h

are

are no Doubt weak Men among the Presbyterians. But does not the same Objection ly against every other Society, tho' against none so much, that I can hear of, through the broad World, as against the *English* Inferiour Clergy? 'The *much greater* Part of those (as the 'Bishop of *Sarum* told us last Year about this same Time) (*m*) who 'come to be ordain'd are *ignorant* to a Degree, not to be apprehended 'by those who are not obliged to know it. The easiest Part of 'Knowledg is that to which they are the greatest Strangers; I mean 'the plainest Parts of the Scriptures, which they say, in Excuse of their 'Ignorance, that their Tutors in the Universities never mention the read- 'ing of to them, so that they can give *no* Account, or at least a *very Im-* 'perfect one, of the Contents even of the *Gospels*. Those who have 'read *some few* Books, yet never seem to have read the *Scriptures*. 'Many cannot give a *tolerable* Account even of the *Catechism* it self, 'how short and plain soever. They cry and think it a sad Disgrace 'to be denyed Orders, tho' the *Ignorance* of some is such, that in a 'well regulated State of Things, they wou'd appear not knowing 'enough to be admitted to the Holy Sacrament. This does often tear 'my Heart. The Case is not much better in *many*, who having 'got into Orders come for Institution, and cannot make it appear 'that they have read the *Scriptures* or any *one* good Book since they 'were ordained, so that the *small* Measure of Knowledg upon which 'They got into Holy Orders not being improved, is in a Way to be 'quite lost. Thus far Bishop *Burnet*. I hope this is some better Testimony than a Copy of a Prayer, not yet delivered, from some Short Hand Writer.

After all this, to make Mr *Rhind* easie, I shall ingenuously confess how far his Charge may be true against the Presbyterian Ministers. Neither these of 'em at *Edinburgh*, ner any of 'em else where are fond of that which *Tillotson* calls *Rumbling Rhetorick* alias *Bombast*: Nor are they carefull to make their Sentences run like Blank Verse, or fall into a Musical Cadence, as if they were just come from reading an *English* Tragedy. They don't affect the *English* Accent without the *English* Phrase: Nor do they aspire to have their Language Soaring in the Clouds, and their Thoughts mean while creeping on the Flat. No; they think it sufficient to deliver themselves in plain *Scotch*,
without

without Flights of Fancy or Points and Turns of Wit; being sensible that such Things are both unsuitable to the Simplicity of the Gospel; and besides, that they wou'd be thrown away on the greatest Part of their Audience. For, They don't believe that every one that wears a fine Hat or a fashionable Head-Dress is a deep Scholar. They know there are vulgar Wits under long Wigs oftimes, as well as under the Natural Hair; and within Silk Scarfs as well as coarse Plaids. And therefore, both in their Prayers and Preachings they adapt their Discourse to *Men of low Degree*; being convinced of Mr *Dryden's* good Sense when he said

*That the strait Gate wou'd be made straiter yet
Were none admitted there but Men of Wit.*

All this I confess, the *Presbyterians* are guilty of; and let Mr *Rhind* improve on it as far as he ever can. The rest of the Charge we shall acknowledge after hearing Probation, which equal Judges I hope will sustain as a Relevant Dilator.

10. In the *last Place* Mr *Rhind* objects the Omission of the *Lord's Prayer*. He does indeed bring in this Objection in his Arguings against the MANNER of our Prayers; and there we shall consider it as an Argument for *Forms*. But he insists upon it likewise as a fundamental Defect; and therefore I shall consider it here while treating of the *Matter* of our Prayers. Now take the Objection in his own Words P. 164. 'If, saith he, the Lord's Prayer be a Form, which when we pray we are commanded to use; and if the Presbyterians totally neglect to use it as such, I appeal to the Reader, whether they are not chargeable with an *Impious* and *fundamental* Omission; and in Consequence, whether all who would not be involved in the Guilt, or run the hazard of offering up an unacceptable, because an Imperfect Worship, should not separate from them.' Thus He. For Answer

The Judgment of a Church is to be gathered from her publick *Formula's*. Now in all these the Presbyterians own it lawfull to use it as a Prayer. The *lesser Catechism* calls it a *Form*. The *larger Catechism* saies it may be used as a Prayer. The *Directory* recommends it to be used as such. The *General Assembly 1705* recommends the Observation of the *Directory*. Accordingly many Ministers do use the Lord's Prayer. I my self use it sometimes, my next Neighbour Minister does the same. His next Neighbour (b. h

of 'em Genuine *Presbyterians*) uses it every Lord's Day. The like do others in several parts of the Nation. 'Tis therefore false what Mr *Rhind* affirms, that the *Presbyterians* totally neglect to use it even in the very Words thereof. But then, to make the Omission of it an *Impious* and *Fundamental* Defect, and a *necessary* Cause of Separation is an uncommon Stretch which hardly any Man wou'd have ventured on, who has Modesty enough to stick at any Thing. And therefore I must crave Leave to reason this Matter somewhat particularly with Mr *Rhind*. And

In the *First* Place I ask. Is Mr *Rhind* or any of his party sure that the Lord's Prayer was not *mainly* intended as a *Pattern* rather than a *Form*. Their Confidence will indeed bear them out to assert any Thing: Yet *Grotius*, one of the most Judicious Criticks the World has yet known, has expressly said upon the Place, ' That ' Christ did not command the WORDS to be recited. But that we ' should take the Materials of our Prayers thence: And He gives this Solid Reason for it, ' That tho' it may be used with great ' Profit as a Form or in the very Words, yet we don't read ' that ever the Apostles used it so. Now let us hear what Mr. *Rhind* has advanced to prove it a *Form*. 1st, ' That it is a Form ' of prayer, saith he, is hence evident, because it is conceived in ' the same Manner as other prayers, that is, with Invocation, Petitions, Doxology and concluding *Amen*. I answer it has all these parts in *Matthew*; but it was twice prescribed upon different Occasions, and so saith *Joseph Mede* himself upon the Subject. And when it was prescribed in *Matthew*, 'tis plain it was designed *only* for a *Pattern*: For the Precept runs thus, *After this Manner therefore pray ye*. Therefore the Argument, that it is conceived *there* in the same Manner as other prayers, is Naught; seeing it was not *there* designed as a prayer but as a *Pattern*. 2^{dly}, ' We are, saith ' Mr. *Rhind*, expressly commanded to SAY *Our Father* &c. But ' it is Nonsense to command us to say a *Pattern*, Therefore we ' are to use it as a *Form*. Thus he. I answer, Mr. *Rhind*'s former Argument destroys this: For it is in *Luke*'s Gospel that we are commanded to SAY *Our Father* &c. But in *Luke*'s Gospel there is neither the Doxology nor the *Amen*. Therefore it is not conceived in the same Manner as other Prayers, in that place where

we are bid SAY it. Nay, *Grotius* is of the Mind that these Clauses *Which art in Heaven*, and *Thy Will be done, as in Heaven so in Earth*, and *Deliver us from Evil*, were not Originally in *Luke's Gospel*, but crept into it out of *Matthew's*. And he gives this Reason for it, That the first Clause *Which art in Heaven* is not extant in the old *Latine Copies*. And the Second Clause, *Thy Will be done as in Heaven so in Earth*, is neither extant in the Old *Latine Copies*, nor in some of the *Greek Copies*. And it is very false what Mr. *Rhind* alledges, that it is Nonsense to bid us say a Pattern: For in every Language, that I know any Thing of, there are greater *Elipses* usual than this *After this Manner* or *To this Purpose*. And so *Luke's Way* of Speaking is very plain, *When Ye pray*, Say viz. *After this Manner*, or *to this Purpose*. Upon the whole, seeing the Lords Prayer was at least mainly intended for a Pattern, which I hope, is now tolerably evident, 'tis pretty hard to conceive how the Omission of it as a Form can be a fundamental Defect.

In the Second Place I ask Mr. *Rhind* and his Party, if they have not observed, that the Words of the Lord's Prayer in the Original are not the same in both Gospels. In *Matthew's* we read *ὁς ἡμῶν σήμερον*. In *Luke's* *δίδς ἡμῶν τὸ καὶ ἡμέραν*. In *Matthew's* *ἄφες ἡμῶν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν*. In *Luke's* *τίς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἀφίεμεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῶν*. 'Tis true, our Saviour probably did not speak in *Greek*. But when the Evangelists have varied so in their Wording of it, 'tis plain that they did not understand our Saviour as meaning to bind them up to Words and Syllables. The like Variation of phrase, which I take Notice of for the *English Reader's* Sake, is observable in our Translation. In *Matthew's Gospel* we read *Thy Will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven*. In *Luke's* *Thy Will be done, as in Heaven so in Earth*. In *Matthew's* *Give us this Day our daily Bread*. In *Luke's* *Give us Day by Day our daily Bread*, and on the Margin *For the Day*. In *Matthew's* *Forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors*. In *Luke's* *Forgive us our Sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us*. And which is strange enough, the *English Liturgy* varies from both: For thus it has it *Forgive us our Trespases as we forgive them that trespass against us*; and in it generally the *Doxology* *For thine is the Kingdom &c* is wanting. Now after all this Variety, is it to be thought that we are tyed up to the Form of Words, or that the Omission of them can be a fundamental Defect.

In the *Third Place*. I ask Mr *Rhind* and his Party, if they are sure, even supposing it were a *Form*, that the Precept for using it was intended for PUBLICK Worship? I don't now ask if it be *lawfull* there, that is granted. But that it was not originally intended for it, I conceive to be somewhat more than probable. 1st, Because in all the publick Ministrations related in the New Testament we never find it used. 2^{dly}, Because our Saviour took Occasion from discoursing on *secret* Prayer to prescribe and give the Command for it. And 3^{dly}, The Disciples did not *then* look upon themselves as Ministers, nor expected ever to be employed as Officers in the Church: Seeing, not only now, but even a long Time after this, yea after Christ's Resurrection, they still imagined that the *Jewish* Polity was to continue, in which those of the Family of *Levi* alone were by Divine Right Church Officers. Now if it was not originally intended for *Publick* Worship, how can the Omission of it in *Publick* Worship be a *fundamental* Defect? Especially, when we are sure, that this, which I have given, was the Sense which the primitive Church had of this Matter. For thus *Augustine* expressly declares (*n*) ' That Christ, in the Delivery of these Petitions, did not teach his Disciples how they shou'd *speak*, or what Words they shou'd use in Prayer; but to whom they were to pray, and what Things they were to pray for, when they were in the Exercise of *Secret* or *Mental* Prayer?'

In the *Fourth Place*. I ask, how can the *Episcopal* Party account for that Sense which they have given of the Precept? And how can they justify that horrid Doctrine which they have founded it on? In the 1st Place, They make the Sense of the Precept *When ye pray, Say, to be, When ye have done with your own Prayers, annex this*. This is such an Insipid Gloss, and so unheard of among the Ancients, that I admire they are not ashamed of it. We are sure that the Ancients either used it alone, or prefixed it to their Prayers when they used it. Thus *Tertullian* (*o*) after a large Commendation of the Lord's Prayer

[n] *Augustin.* de Magistro Cap. 1. *Aug.* Non te ergo movet Dominus summus Magister, cum orare doceret discipulos, verba quædam docuit, in quo nihil aliud videtur fecisse, quam docuisse quomodo in orando loqui oportet: *Ad.* Nihil me omnino istud movet: non enim verba, sed respicias eos verbis docuit, quibus et se ipsi commune tacerent, a Quo, Quid esset orandum, cum in penetralibus, ut dictum est, mentis orarent. *Aug.* Recte intelligis.

[o] Possè nos super adjicere. Quoniam tamen Dominus prospector humanarum necessitatum seorsim post traditam orandi disciplinam, Petite, inquit, & accipietis, & sunt quæ petantur, pro Circumstantia Cujusque, præmissa legitima & ordinaria oratione quasi fundamento, accidentium jus est desideriorum. Jus est superstruendi.--- De Oratione p. 659.

Prayer adds, ' We may add thereunto; For since the Lord the Provider for all Human Necessities, has in another Place, after He had delivered this Prayer, said, *Ask and ye shall receive*: And every one has particular Circumstances to beg for, therefore having *promised* the lawfull and ordinary Prayer, there is place for accidental Requests. Thus He. But whether they prefixed it, or annexed it; they had no Opinion of the *fundamental Necessity* of doing so; an infallible Argument of which is, that we find them frequently praying without the Lord's Prayer, either at the Beginning or Ending of their Prayers. Thus, as Sir *Peter King* has already noted (p) In the Heavenly Prayer of *Polycarpus* at the Stake, The Lord's Prayer is neither at Beginning nor Ending. Thus *Clemens Alexandrinus* concludes his last Book of *Pedagogy*, with a Prayer which neither ends nor begins with the Lord's Prayer; and *Origen* (q) prescribing a Method of Prayer, speaks not a Word of the Lord's Prayer; but advises both to begin and end with Doxology, or a giving Praise to God. This they wou'd never have done, had they believed that it was fundamentally *necessary* to join the Lord's Prayer with their own. With what Reason then can our *Scots* Episcopalians make that the Sense of the Precept? But then 2dly, The Principle upon which they found this Sense is a most horrid one: For they assert, that the joining it with our own Imperfect Prayers renders them acceptable before God; as, on the other Hand, the Want of it makes them unacceptable. This is plain from Mr *Rhind's* Words before cited. Now what else is this but to turn that Excellent Prayer into an Idolatrous Charm, and to make the Repetition of it supply the Place of the Merit and Intercession of our Saviour? I ask now whether the *Presbyterian's* Omission of it, or the *Episcopalian's* Usage of it upon such a Principle be the more accountable?

To conclude this Matter. 'Tis true the Lord's Prayer was early used in the publick assemblies of Christians. But it was not used more than once at one Assembly: Not in Prayers before or after Sermon, not at all in the *Catechumen's* Office, but in the *Eucharistical* Office, and even there they did not apprehend that Christ enjoined them

[p] Enquiry into the Constitution &c of the Primitive Church, Part II. P. 27.
 [q] De Oratione Sect. 22. p. 134. 135.

them to use the Words. And thus many others (r) both of the *Protestant* and *Roman* Communion have understood it. So much for the Exceptions against the *Matter* of the Prayers of the *Presbyterians*. Part of which Exceptions are manifestly false in *Fact*, and all the Rest of the things excepted against, Justifiable, at least as *Lawfull*, and for the most Part as *Duty*.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Exception against the Manner of the Presbyterian's Prayers, is considered. From P. 156. to P. 177.

MR Rhind frequently affirms them to be *highly Imperfect* in this Respect. The only Reason he gives is, that they are performed in the *Extemporary* Way, as he expresses it. For making this a *high Imperfection*, He I. Insists upon the huge Disadvantages of it. II. Effays by Arguments to prove the Excellency, if not the Necessity, of the *Liturgick* Way.

I. He insists upon the Disadvantages of the *Extemporary* Way among the *Presbyterians*, which he lays out in *Three* particulars.

The *First* Disadvantage is, ' That a Man is discharged the use of *all* ' helps, and is desired to depend *only* upon the Motion of the Spirit ' p. 157. The Result of which is, that when one is not blessed ' with the Gift of prayer, he is tempted to neglect it altogether; or if ' he essay it once, and finds that he cannot perform it to any tolerable purpose, he is discouraged from any further Attempt; and so must

[r] *Maldonat*. in *Matth.* 5. 9. Non his necessario verbis, sed hac aut simili sententia-- nam non Apostolos orando his ipsis verbis usos fuisse legimus, aliis legimus. Neque voluit Christus, ut quotiescunque oramus, ista omnia, quæ hac oratione continentur, peteremus, sed ut omnia, aut aliqua, aut nihil certe his contrarium peterem. *Cusaubon*. Exercit. 235. Christus vero non de predicatione Dei laudum agit, sed ut recte monet *Augustinus*, de modo concipiendi preces privatas. *Jansen* in *Luc.* 11. Itaque ut disceremus in oratione, non tam de verbis, quam de rebus esse anxij, ac de spiritu orationis, diversis verbis orationem tradidit. *Vide Jackson* on Liturgies.

' must continue in Ignorance and Irreligion; the obtaining of which
' among the Generality of people, *saieth He*, is in a great Measure
' owing to the Want of *Forms*. Or if a person grossly Ignorant
' yet adventure to pray, his performance must be crowded with
' *flat Impertinencies, Substantial Nonsense and horrid Blasphemies*, all
' which is *unavoidable* in the *Extemporary* Way. To this purpose
he p. 156, 157. Is it possible Mr *Rhind* cou'd be 22 Years among the
Presbyterians, and not know that what he has laid down for the Founda-
tion of all this, is even a transparent Falshood. Was he not sensible
that every one, that cou'd open his Eyes and read *Englisb*, was in a Ca-
pacity to convince him of the grossest Calumny and Slander? Do the
Presbyterians Discharge the Use of all Helps in Prayer either to Ministers
or Private Christians? Was not the *Directory* for the *Publick* Worship
of God compiled on purpose to give them both *Help* and *Furniture*?
(s). Is not every Minister therein exhorted to be *carefull to furnish both*
his Heart and Tongue with farther and other Materials, as shall be need-
full upon all Occasions? Hath not the General Assembly given *Dire-*
ctions (t), and suggested *Materials* for *Private* Prayer? Nay do
they not expressly recommend *Forms* of prayer to the Rude and
Weaker (v)? What meant he then to say, that they are *discharged*
the use of all helps; and desired to depend only upon the Motion of the Spi-
rit? Did he presume that his party were given up to *believe a Lye*?
With what Confidence cou'd he impute the *Stupid Ignorance* and
Height of Impiety to the Want of *Forms*? Does he not know that in
England, where there is no Want of them, a brutal Ignorance pre-
vails among the Vulgar, and Impieties reign, yet, I hope, unknown
on this Side *Tweed*. Mr. *Rhind* has taken a great deal of Pains to
represent the Gift of Prayer as an unattainable Thing. But hear
Bishop *Wilkins* upon it. ' As for the pretended Difficulty of it
' *saieth he* (x), I shall in this Discourse make it evident, that if it
' be Seriously attempted (as all Religious Businesses ought to be)
' 'tis easie to be attained by any one that has but common Capacity.
And I suppose every Body who has read his Discourse is con-
vinced he has made his Word good.

I i

The

[s] See Preface to the Directory. [t] See them annexed to the Confess. of Faith. *Edinburgh*
Printed by James Watson 1703. [v] Ibid, Sect. 9. [x] Gift of Prayer Chap. 11. p. 12. 11.

The *Second* Disadvantage of *Extemporary* Prayer is the Danger, or at least the Uncertainty of the Lawfulness of Joining in it. For ' Suppose, *saieth he* p. 157, a Man who is Master of a tolerable *Extemporary* Faculty, is the Orator; yet even in that Case, before ' he begin, ye are under an Uncertainty whether what he shall ' say be Right or Wrong: This keeps the Spirit in Suspence. Perhaps the third or fourth Petition is dubious or ungrounded, which ye ' cannot offer up to God. Perhaps the next ye hear is flat or Impertinent, and therefore grating to a Man of Sense. To this purpose he. Is not this a pretty Way of arguing by *Perhaps's*? I need not spend Time upon such Chimerical Stuff. Take the Answer from Bishop *Wilkins* in the place last cited. ' Whereas, *saieth he*, 'tis commonly objected by some, that they cannot so well join ' in an unknown *Form* with which they are not before Hand acquainted. I answer, that's an Inconsiderable Objection, and does ' oppose all Kind of *Forms* that are not publicly prescribed. As ' a Man may in his *Judgment* assent unto any Divine *Truth* delivered in a *Sermon*, which he never heard before; so may he ' join in his *Affections* unto any Holy *desire*, which he never heard before. If he who is the Mouth of the Rest, shall through Impudence deliver that which we cannot approve of, God does not ' look upon it as our prayer, if our Desires do not say *Amen* to it. Thus he. And Nothing cou'd have been said more patly to the present Objection.

The *Third* Disadvantage attending *Extemporary* prayer is, ' That ' even where there is Nothing amiss in the Matter of the prayer, ' yet the Hearer cannot at once exercise that Seriousness and *Intention* with Respect to God, and that *Attention* which is Necessary to catch what drops from him who prays. Thus Mr. *Rhind* p. 158. But this is an Objection of the same Nature with the former; an Objection to which His own whimsical Imagination is both Father and Mother. Tho' Mr *Rhind* pretends he cannot do both at once. Yet I believe every Man else in the World finds it not only possible but easie to do. When there is Nothing amiss in the *Matter* of the Prayer, which is his Supposition, a Man must be very Glib of the Tongue, if my Thoughts cannot hold Pace with him: And the *Intenseness* of my *Affections* will be

be so far from being a Hinderance, that it will be a Help to the *Attention* of my *Thoughts*.

But now are not all these Imaginary Disadvantages as frequent and as obvious in the *Liturgick* Way. For what if a Man have not a Common Prayer Book, or cannot read, or has not the Form by Heart, all which are Cases that most frequently happen? Must he not quite neglect Prayer at Home? And is it not impossible for him to exercise both *Attention* and *Intention* at once when he comes to Church? Is not the looking upon the Book and reading, a greater Diversion to the Affections than any Thing can be mention'd in the Extemporary Way? Besides, does not Mr *Rhind*, who is so well acquaint with the *Animal Oeconomy*, know, that when one is accustomed to a Form, there is the greatest Danger of falling into *Lip-Service* and *Formality*; and the greatest Difficulty in exercising either *Attention* or *Intention*? 'Tis certainly so. Every Man knows it who has tryed it; and Bishop *Wilkins* who was a great Philosopher as well as a great Divine has observed it (γ). ' In this Case, *saith he*, ' it should be specially remembered, that in the Use of such prescript Forms, to which a Man hath been accustomed, he ought to be ' narrowly watchfull over his own Heart, for fear of that *Lip-Service* ' and *Formality*, which in such Cases we are more especially exposed ' unto. Thus He. So much for the pretended Disadvantages that attend *Extemporary* Prayer, which I think are pretty *real* in the *Liturgick* Way.

II. Mr. *Rhind* essays by Arguments to prove the Excellency of the *Liturgick* Way. And he argues it to be the Best. *First*, from the Nature of the Thing. *Secondly*, From Universal practice. *Thirdly*, From the Approbation of Heaven both in the Old and New Testament. *Fourthly*, From the Usage of the Primitive and Ancient Church. And *Lastly*, From the practice of the Reformed Churches. And then he concludes all with answering the Objection, that *Forms Stint the Spirit*.

First, He argues for the Excellency of the *Liturgick* Way from the Nature of the Thing p. 159, 160. *God*, *saith he*, *ought to be worshipped in the best Manner possible*. 'Tis granted. *A Form of Worship*, subumes he, *which always presupposes Fore-Thought is incomparably better than the Extemporary Way, which requires little or none*

at all. Who told him that the Extemporary Way requires *little or no Fore-Thought*? Did ever the *Presbyterians* teach so? Have they not in their *Directory* enjoined each Minister ‘to stir up the Gifts of Christ in himself, and, by Meditation as well as by observing the Ways of Divine providence and other Methods, to furnish himself with *Materials* of prayer? Does not every Presbyterian who treats of that Subject enjoin the same? Have they ever taught otherwise than Bishop *Wilkins* himself has taught in this Case (2) viz. ‘That generally it is both lawfull and Necessary to prepare our selves, as for this Gift in general, so for every particular Act of it, by premeditating, if we have Leisure for it, both Matter and Order and Words: And that tho’ it be a Gift of the Spirit, yet it is not to be expected, that it shou’d suddenly be infused into us without any precedent Endeavours of our own. Again how shall he convince us that the *Liturgick* Way *always* presupposes Fore-Thought? ’Tis true it did so in the Compilers; but it is well enough known that it does not so in the Users. How often is it seen that while they are crying, *Be Mercifull to us Miserable Sinners*, they are, as a late Excellent Author hath told us, ogling their Sweet Hearts in the next pew? And does not every Body feel it, that when they know before Hand what is to be said, they are very rarely attentive to it. But let us hear him proceed. ‘If it be Best, *saith He*, to have the prayer formed before I pronounce it, what is the Harm though I transcribe it from my Memory? None at all that I know of. *Nay, saith He, will I not be so much the more sure of it, if I do this?* Certainly. For *Littera Scripta Manet*, and the pocket is oftimes a Surer Repository than the Memory. *And if I may safely write it*, adds He, *why not READ it too?* I know no Reason why he may not, a Hundred Times over if he pleases. And yet ’tis very possible he may all this while not *pray* it once over: For I cannot see why *reading* a prayer, where there is no more, should be called *praying*, any more than why reading a prophesie shou’d be called *prophesying*. But now to discourse this Business of *Reading* prayers a little.

I

I ask Mr *Rhind* where does he find In the *First* place that prayers were Read in the primitive Church? Is there the least Vestige of it for several hundreds of years after Christ? Do not *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, all tell us that the Ancient Christians in prayer lifted up their Eyes to Heaven (a). Does not *Chrysostome* observe from Christ's Posture in prayer expressed *John XVII. 1.* 'That thereby we are taught when we pray to lift up both the Eyes of Body and Mind? Is not the Emperor *Constantine* represented on his Coins and Medals in a Praying posture, yet not reading on a book, but with Eyes lift up to Heaven (b)? Does not *Augustine* intimate as much when he tells us upon *John XVII. 1.* that Christ so prayed, as *mind*ing to teach us how we should pray? Where is now the Warrant from Antiquity for reading prayers? 2dly, Is there any more Warrant for it from Scripture? Did the humble Publican, tho' in the Temple, Read his prayers? Or did the Pharisee pray by a Form? Did the Disciples, when caught in the Storm, pull out their Common-prayer Book, and read the Forms to be used at Sea? Did *Jonah* or the Mariners do it? Is there so much as a Whisper of this in the Bible? No indeed. A Sense of present Danger is worth Twenty Common prayer Books; according to that known Saying *Qui nescit Orare discat Navigare, who would learn to pray, let him go to Sea.*

And 'tis a plain Case, no Man wants a Prayer book who is in a Frame for praying: And he that is not in such a Frame, may indeed Read Prayers, but I don't think he can be said to pray.

But let us go on with Mr *Rhind's* Argument. 'If that prayer, *sait* he, which I form before hand be better than that which I utter off hand, then certainly the Form prepared by the joint Endeavours of Many (allowing each of them to be neither better nor wiser than my self) is by great Odds preferable to my single Endeavour. Here Mr *Rhind* and I differ: For I have seldom yet observed a Composure by several hands so well done, as that wherein only one was concerned. And the Reason is evident; that, which is done by one,

is

[a] See Sir *Peter King* Ubi Supra Part II Chap. II. Sect. 3. & *Clarkson* on Liturgies. p. 9. &c
 [b] *Euseb. de vita Constantini* Lib. IV. Cap. 15.

is usually all of a piece; whereas that, which has many hands at the doing of it, generally makes but a linsy-woolsey kind of Stuff. Besides, tho' a prayer, formed before hand either by my self or others may be more pointed as to its Wording, and have more of a Logical Method in it; yet 'tis very possible that abrupt and independent Sentences, breaking from a Contrite Heart, and a Soul flaming with the Love of Jesus, may be more acceptable to God and more profitable to my self.

From all this Reasoning Mr. Rhind concludes that, *that Form which the Church has provided* (He means the *English Liturgy*) *has unspeakable Advantages above any one Man's Performance* But herein Mr. Rhind's Taste and mine differ as much about the *Preference* of Forms, as our Judgments do about the *Use* of them. For I am perfectly convinced that the Devotions of the Author of the *whole Duty of Man*, or Symon Patrick's Devotions, or Jeremy Taylor's Devotions, or even Dorington's Devotions are incomparably better than those of the *Liturgy*; and I wonder how any Man that has read both can make the least doubt of it: Pray what shou'd make the *English Liturgy* so preferable? He answers, because it is the Result of the wisest Council and most Mature Deliberation, the Effect of the United Endeavours of Men Holy and Wise, who no doubt implored and obtained the Assistance and Direction of the Blessed Spirit, in compiling a Form which they were perswaded was the Best and most acceptable Manner of worshipping God. But 1st, Has Mr. Rhind considered how small the Part of the Compilers was? They did indeed Tack the several Parts together; but the Materials were formed to their Hand. The *Lessons* out of the Old and New Testament and Apocrypha, the *Psalms* to be read Monthly, the *Epistles* and *Gospels*, the Passages of Scripture at the Beginning of *Morning* and *Evening Prayer*, the *Lord's Prayer* so often repeated, the *Venite Exultemus*, the *Benedictus*, the *Benedicite*, the *Jubilate Deo*, the *Cantate Domino*, the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc Demittis*, the *Deus Misereatur*, the *Litany*, the *Ten Commandments*, the *three Creeds*, the *Te Deum* were all of 'em formed long ere the Compilers of the *Liturgy* were born. The *Collects* are generally out of the *Breviary*; the Prayers in the Standing Offices out of the *Missal* and *Ritual*. Abstract these Parts from the *Liturgy*, and I suppose the Compiler's Work will appear to be very casie.

ease. 2dly, Why did Mr. Rhind say that the Authors of the Liturgy compiled a Form *which they were persuaded was the best and most acceptable Manner of worshipping God*? Does he not know that all History contradicts this? They did not so much as aim at that which was in it self *best*, but at what the Times could best bear, with any Colour of Reformation; and therefore composed the Liturgy so as was most likely to gain the *Papists*, and to draw them into their Church Communion, by varying as little as well they could from the *Romish* Forms before in Use. This K. Edward ingenuously told the *Devonshire* Rebels. 'Tho' *saieth He*, it seemeth to you a New Service, 'yet indeed it is no other but the old, the self same Words in *Engliss* that were in *Latine*: For nothing is altered but to speak with 'Knowledge that which was spoken with Ignorance, only a few 'Things taken out, so fond that it had been a Shame to have heard 'them in *Engliss*. Thus He (c). And indeed the Reformers acted prudently, according to the then Circumstances, in striving what they could to gain the *Papists*: But to go on in the same Method now after a Hundred and Fifty Years Experience of its Unsuccessfulness, and when 'tis plain that the altering it would gain the *Dissenters*; this Conduct, I must needs say, argues a better Memory than a Judgment; and shews a much greater Regard to the *Papist* than the Reformed Interest. 3dly, What Assistance of the Spirit was it which the Compilers implored and obtain'd? It was not Assistance as to the *Matter*. It was not Assistance as to the *Form*: For Mr Rhind has expressly said p. 175. *that our Prayers are not dictated by the Spirit either as to Matter or Form*. 'Tis then beyond my Comprehension to understand wherein they were assisted; For, to say that they were assisted in tacking the several Parts together, were to assign too low an Office to the Holy Ghost.

It will not be unpleasant, ere I leave this Argument, to consider the Motives which, Mr Rhind alledges, prevailed with the first Compilers and Imposers of the Liturgy, to restrict Ministers and People to the Use thereof.

'They were sensible, *saieth He* p. 161, of the Disadvantages of the
Extrem-

‘ Extemporary Way, even in their own Experience: They observed moreover, that the Ignorant, that is, the *Gross* of Mankind, could not, and therefore did not pray at all; that the Gifted Brethren and their Hearers too often mistook the Warmth and Quickness of the Fancy, and the Readiness of Expression for the Dictates of the Spirit, which swelled the former with a High Conceit of themselves (a Frame of Mind of all others the most unsuitable in Devotion) and made the latter Lie against the Holy Ghost: Besides, they found that this Liberty which Men were allowed, sometimes tempted them to vent their New and dangerous Notions, as the Inspirations of the Holy Ghost; and therefore the Church, to assist the Weakness of the one, and to check the Vanity and Presumption of the other, restricted both to the Use of Forms. Thus He.

A very pointed Speech this! But is there the least Footstep in History to support it? Is there the least hint given that the Compilers and Imposers of the Liturgy proceeded upon these Motives? Nay, is it not certain that they had not these Motives to Proceed on? Were the *Extemporizers* so early, as that the ill Effects of their Extemporizing appeared even before the compiling of the Liturgy? Is it not certain that till the compiling of the *Liturgy*, and the *Primer* that went before it, the People still worshiped according to the old *Papish* Forms? Yes. Every body that knows any thing of the history of the *Liturgy* knows all this to be true. Is it not strange then that Mr *Rhind* shou’d abuse his Reader with a whole String of Fictions? I cannot but heartily wish that our *Scots* Prelatick Writers wou’d consult one another ere they publish their Productions: For, if Mr *Rhind* is right, he has quite defeat Doctor *South*, Mr *Calder*, the late *Vindicator* of the fundamental Charter, and I know not how many more of ‘em, who make *Faithfull Cumming* and *Thomas Heath* a Jesuite the first Authors of Extemporary Prayer in Q. *Elizabeth’s* Reign, about twenty Years after the compiling of the Liturgy. Plainly, the other Writers of the party make Extemporary prayer an Invention to put the Liturgy out of Request after it was formed. But Mr. *Rhind* makes Extemporary Prayer to have been first, and the Liturgy to have been compiled and imposed on purpose to Remedy the ill Effects of it, and to prevent them for the future. Did ever any party before blow thus cold and hot? Was ever party so doom’d,

as they are, to contradict one another, or to blurt out what comes first, without regarding what they say or whereof they affirm?

Some perhaps may alledge in Excuse of Mr *Rhind*, that he meant all this of the *Scots* Liturgy sent down by K. *Charles I.* Anno 1637. No. Through all his Book he does not so much as once mention that Liturgy; *the *English* Liturgy he does, and sets it in opposition to the *Westminster Directory* p. 174. Besides, there was no need of the Assistance of the Spirit in composing that: For, except in some things wherein it comes nearer to *Popery*, and some few other things utterly indifferent, it was copied *verbatim* from the *English* Liturgy. And as they did not need, so the Event plainly shewed, that they *had* not the Assistance of the Spirit either in *composing* or *imposing* of it. It was *imposed* without Law by the Arbitrary Will of the Prince; and I'm sure the Spirit of God never assists Men in illegal practices. And for the *Composure* of it, 'tis known Archbishop *Laud* was the Father of it, with the consent of some others no whit better than himself. And that *Common Prayer* proved indeed the *Common Fire* of both Nations. 'We shall find them (the Bishops) saith the Excellent Lord *Falkland* in his forecited Speech, to have kindled and blown the Common Fire of both Nations, to have both sent and maintained that Book; of which the Author, no doubt, hath long since wished with *Nero*, *Utinam nescissem Literas!* And of which, more than one Kingdom hath Cause to wish, that when he wrote that, He had rather burned a Library, tho' of the Value of *Ptolemy's*. Plainly the great Intendment of that Book was a Conformity with *England*, by which we were never much Gainers in former Times; tho' no doubt we shall be so, now that we are upon the Footing of an Union, so legally founded, and whose *Articles* have hitherto been so sacredly maintained. But enough of this Argument.

Secondly, Mr *Rhind* argues for the Excellency of the *Liturgick* Way from *Universal Practice*. 'It has been, saith he p. 161, *undeniably* the practice of all Men in all Nations and Ages (if we shall only except these who truly were, or falsely pretended to be inspired) to address the true God, or their supposed Deities, by certain Forms. Mr *Rhind* is too positive. For as he cannot but know that this *has* been *denied*, so, without the Spirit of Prophecy I can

foretell, it will be *denyed* to the End of the World. *The Practice of all Men*, saith he, *in all Nations and Ages?* Why, *first*, did our first Parents in the Estate of Innocence worship by Forms? No Man ever dreamed it; and I think *Milton* wou'd charm any Body from the belief of it by his incomparably beautifull Lines, wherein he describes their Morning Devotions which they payed to their Maker at the Door of their Bower (a).

*Lowly they bow'd adoreing, and began
Their Orisons, each Morning duly pay'd
In various Stile, for neither various Stile
Nor Holy Rapture wanted they to praise
Their Maker, in fit Strains pronounc'd or Sung
Unmeditated, such prompt Eloquence
Flow'd from their Lips in Prose or Numerous Verse
More tuneable than needed Lute or Harp
To add more Sweetness.....*

This was the Original Practice, and 'tis to that we ought to aspire. 2dly, Did any of the other Antediluvian Patriarchs Worship by Forms? Not a Word of this in the Scripture, and that is the only Book which gives us the History of that Time. 'Tis indeed said *Gen. IV. 26. Then began Men to call upon the Name of the Lord.* But, waving other Senses of that Text, *Bishop Patrick* tells us, that a great Number of the Jewish Writers, with whom *M. Selden* joins in his *De Dijs Syris*, and the Arabick Interpreter expound it thus *Then was there Prophanation by invoking the Name of the Lord viz. by giving it impiously to Creatures.* Whether that be the exact right Sense and Translation or not, is not to our present Purpose, yet thence we may gather that 'tis impossible ever to hammer a Liturgy out of it. 3dly, Did *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob*, or any other down to *Moses* use a Liturgy or worship by Forms? No. There is not the least Intimation thereof in the Scripture. Here then we find 2000 Years, that is, the *third* Part of the World's Age fully spent, without so much as a Hint of Forms. How then cou'd it be the Practice in all Ages to worship by them? Yet further 4bly, Is there any Hint of Forms for the Space of five Hundred

Hundred Years after *viz.* from *Moses* to *David*? 'Tis true we read of a Form of Words used upon some Solemn Occasions, such as the Priest's blessing the People *Numb.* VI, and the Thanksgiving at the Offering of the First Fruits *Deut.* XXVI, and when the Ark went forward or rested *Numb.* X. But, that there was a stated Form for their *Daily Service*, there is a deep Silence in the Scripture; which is a certain Argument that there was none, seeing the Scripture is so minute in observing Particulars of much less Moment. 'Tis hardly to be thought that the Scripture, which noticed almost every Pin in the Tabernacle, and every Fringe and Plait in the Priest's Vestments, wou'd have omitted the Form of Words to be used in the daily Service, if any such had been prescribed.

As there is no Mention of any Liturgy among God's Peculiar for so long a Time, so, I believe, 'tis as plain that there was none used elsewhere. *Homer* in his *Iliad* is the most Ancient, Authentick and Judicious Witness extant of the Devotions of the Pagans both *Greeks* and *Barbarians*. He hardly ever brings forth his *Heroes* to fight, or leads the Armies into the Field, but he sets them a Praying; and indeed he makes Them pray very well according to the then Theology. Yet he never makes the particular prayers of the *Heroes*, nor even the publick Prayers of the Army such as any Form directed, but such as Their present Circumstances suggested: And *Homer* knew the Rules of *Decorum* better than to have made Them pray *Extempore*, if it had been the then Custom to pray by *Form*.

Thirdly, He argues for the Preference of the *Liturgick* Way from *Heaven's* Approbation of it both under the Old and New Testament p. 162. Well where is this Approbation to be found. 'Why, saith he, what else are the greatest Part of the *Psalms* but Forms of Prayer and Praises, which were composed for, and used in the Service of the Temple? Right. And the *Presbyterians* make use of them to this Day in their publick Worship as much, perhaps more than ever the *Jews* did. So that thus far we are for *Forms* as much as they. And 'tis a most horrid and gross Calumny, that the *Presbyterians* assert the Unlawfulness of set *Forms*.* I desire the Reader to advert to this, because, not only Mr *Rhind*, but his whole Fellow Writers charge them with it, without so much as offering

at Proof of it. Therestricting either Ministers or People to Forms, to pray so and *no otherwise*, they avow to be impious Tyranny : But, that Forms are in themselves unlawfull, they never asserted. Besides, it is ridiculous to argue from inspired Forms to Human Compositions. But, adds Mr Rhind, *the Jews used Forms of their own Composition in the Synagogue, where our Lord was so often present, and yet he never declared against them.* But 1st, Why did not Mr Rhind point us to where these Forms might be found ? There is not the least Mention of them in the Four Gospels. *The curious*, saith he, *may consult them in the Original Hebrew, or as they are translated into the more known Languages.* But why did he not name the Book ? Every Body knows that many of their pretended *ancient* Forms of Devotion are meer Forgeries. And their *Modern* Forms are ridiculous in the last Degree. 2^{dly}, Why has he not proved that these Synagogue Forms were *imposed*, and that such as officiate were *restricted* to them ? Without this his Argument signifies nothing. 3^{dly}, Was every Thing lawfull which our Lord did not declare against ? By the Law of God the High Priesthood was fixed in the eldest of *Aaron's* Family. In *Christ's* Time it was set to Sale in the most mercenary Manner. *Cajaphas* was both Sacrilegious and an Usurper. But where did *Christ* declare against either the Person or the Practice ? But, urges he, *Christ himself prescribed a Form, which is a precedent, whereas for the Extemporary Way there is neither Precept nor warrantable Example in the Scripture.* Is not this strange Confidence ? Are there no Examples of Prayer in the new Testament but the *Lord's Prayer* ? Is there the least Hint that any one of them was made by a Form ? Is there the least Hint that the *Lord's Prayer* it self was used as a Form ? Does he think none of the Prayers in the New Testament were *warrantable* ? Let him find, if he can, from the Beginning of *Matthew* to the End of the *Revelation*, so much as any one Prayer made by a Form, and I'll quit him the Cause ? Even the *Lora's Prayer* it self when it was prescribed by *Christ*, yet was not put up to God by *Him* ; nay indeed He *could* not put it up to God, He could not say *Forgive us our Sins*, because He had no Sin to be forgiven. And as for His Prayer in the Garden, will any Man say that *Christ* followed a Form in it ? Nay indeed is not an Agony incompatible with a Form ? A Form is too cold a Kind
of

of Service for such a violent Exercise of the Soul. Besides, it is certain that Christ did not thrice repeat the same Prayer in the same very Words. Nor does the Scripture assert any such Thing, as has been lately made out (e) beyond Possibility of Reply. And to make an Argument for stated and prescribed Forms, as Mr Rhind does p. 173, and his Brethren commonly do, from the Apostles using frequently the same Form of Blessing, is below even Meanness itself. The Apostle Paul himself does not always use the very same Words, and the Apostles Peter and John differ in their Words both from him and from one another. Suppose they had all three used the same Words always, it cou'd not have so much as the Semblance of an Argument for a Liturgy.

Fourthly, He argues for the *Liturgick* Way from the Usage of it in the Primitive and Ancient Church. *Certain stated Forms*, saith he p. 166, *being then universally used in the most solemn Administrations*. It were some Comfort to have to do with an Adversary who at least pretended to Proof; but, to be obliged still to dispute against meer Assertion, is the most irksome Thing in the World. Our *Episcopal* Liturgists, a considerable while ago, gave *Advertisement* to the Nation (f) that they were to reprint a Body of Liturgies, to shew (I keep their own Words) *that in all Churches and Ages of Christianity Liturgies have been used*. They were instantly taken up on this (g) and desired to begin at the Right End, and to publish the Liturgies of the *three* first Centuries, which wou'd be a more prevailing Argument with the Presbyterians, than the Liturgies of *ten* Centuries immediately back from our selves can be. But Nothing of this have they done, And I am very well assured it cannot be done. They are so far from being able to give us the Liturgies of *all* Churches, that I hereby defy them to give us the Liturgy of *any* Church through the Broad Earth during that Period. But this is the ordinary Politick of the Writers of that Side, to gull their Lay Friends with Promises of what every Man in the World, who knows any Thing of these Matters, knows to be impossible to be performed. Certainly the Lord's Supper is the most *Solemn* of all the Christian Administrations; and if *prescribed Forms* had been used
any

[e] See *Calder's* Ans. to the I Dialogue examin'd p. 35, 37, [f] *Storr's* Courant Numb. 1087.
[g] See Letter to a Friend concerning H. *Calder's* Return. p. 15.

any where, they wou'd be most likely to be found there. The *Liturgical* Party then is desired, as they value the Reputation of their Judgment or Learning, and as they wou'd not be held for meer Quacks and Mountebanks, to publish the *prescribed* Forms that were used in the Administration of the Lord's Supper for the first *three* Centuries: Nay, to make their Task easier, to prove that there were *prescribed* Forms used in the Administration of it. In the mean Time let the Reader say, what unparalleled Confidence it was in Mr *Rhind*, to boast of *universal Usage*, and yet not to adduce so much as *one* small Instance for the Proof of it. But there is a People in the World that *make Lies their Refuge*, and therefore we are not to wonder at it.

Lastly, He argues from the Practice of the *Reformed Churches* p. 167. It is very true the *Reformed Churches* have their Liturgies. But I have already * proved, that the *Scots* were not restricted to *Knox's* Liturgy, but allowed to use their own Freedom. The Like is plainly observable in the *Belgick, French, Geneva* and *German* Liturgies. Nay some of the *forreign* Liturgies are not so much *Liturgies* as *Directions*. Such is the *Liturgia Tigurina* published by *Lavater*. The Reformers found it necessary in the Beginning of the Reformation, both upon the Account of People's Ignorance, being newly come out of the Popish Darknes, and upon the Account of their having been accustomed to *Forms*, to continue on in the same Method of Worship; and Things not being yet come to a Settlement in *England*, and the Clergy being exceeding weak, *Calvin* in His letter to the *Protector* advised a stated Form of Prayers: But that, when Things are brought into a regular Channel, and the Church furnished with *able Ministers*, They shou'd yet be bound up from praying to God as His Spirit should direct them, and as the emergent Necessities of their People might require, the Reformers never intended, *Calvin* never advised. On the contrary, immediatly after he has advised the *Protector* to settle a stated Form of Prayers; he excites him, by all Means to seek out for able Ministers, that so the Native Vigour of the Gospel might not languish through Occasion of that

Poli-

* See before P. 2.

Political Settlement (*b*). So much for Mr *Rhind's* Arguments for the *Liturgick* Way, which this Nation, I'm sure, has no Reason to be fond of, when 'tis remembred that we never knew in earnest, from the first Dawning of the Reformation, what War, Confusion and Bloodshed meant, till a certain Headstrong Party wou'd needs impose it upon us in an Arbitrary Manner, and restrict the Nation to it, not only without Reason or Argument, but even without Shadow of Law.

He proceeds next p. 169 &c to answer the Objection against restricting People to *Forms* viz. *that they stint the Spirit*. And in Answer to this he absolutely denies that *the Spirit of God dictates the Substance and Manner of Prayer*. A Doctrine hitherto, I believe, unheard of among Christians. For, it is one of the peculiar Titles of the Holy Ghost to be stiled the *Spirit of Supplication*, because of that special Influence which He hath in the bestowing of this Gift. And as a *Spirit of Grace and Supplication* He is promised *Zech. XII. 10.* to all God's People. And *Gal. IV. 6.* it is given as the Character of all true Christians that *God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts crying Abba Father*. But Mr *Rhind* does not find this Gift *Viz.* the *Spirit of prayer* enumerated *I Cor. XII.* among the other extraordinary Gifts which were bestowed upon the Church at *Pentecost*. No Wonder truly. For it is none of the extraordinary Gifts, but what every good Christian, without Exception, is endued with. Nor did ever any Man (before Mr *Rhind*) that worshipped the true God, since the Creation of the World deny, that ever there was any good Prayer which was not suggested by the Spirit of God. But why do I speak of the Worshipers of the TRUE GOD? Even the Pagan Idolaters had a better Sense of Religion than Mr *Rhind*. Thus *Homer* in his ninth *Iliad* brings in old *Phœnix* Preaching to *Achilles*.

Prayers are the Daughters of Almighty Jove. Upon which *Madam Dacier* comments thus. *For 'tis God inspires Prayers, and teaches Men to Pray.* The Apostle *Paul* asserts expressly *Rom. VIII. 26.* That

we

[b] Sic igitur statum esse Catechismi oportet, statum sacramentorum administrationem, publicam hominum formulam. Sed non hoc eo pertinet ut minus politici ordinis in Ecclesia regere, vigo. instructionis, catechisationis Evangelij illo modo confiteri. In illa potius incumbendum est tibi, ut ad hoc & nonnulli Ecclesiasticos conquirantur. ---- Calv. Ep. ad protest. Anglia.

we knew not what we should pray for as we ought: But that the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities and maketh Intercession for us with Groans that cannot be uttered. But if, according to Mr Rhind's Doctrine, the Spirit dictates neither *Matter* nor *Words*, neither *Substance* nor *Manner* of Prayer, how can he be said to *help our Infirmities*? Mr Rhind saw how cross this Text lay to his Doctrine, but, to avoid the force of it, he puts such a Comment upon it as was never heard of before, such a Comment as is heretical in the highest Degree, nay such a Comment as subverts the very Foundation of the Gospel. Plainly, he affirms that Men's *Fervency* and *Sincerity* in prayer is the sole Effect of their own Endeavours: And that the Office of the Holy Ghost is not to excite to, or assist in Prayer, but to interceed for the *Acceptance* of it.

That I may not be thought to aggravate Matters, take his own Words p. 170. 171.

' And if *the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities*, it is supposed that we do something our Selves, and that whatever is wanting to make our prayers *acceptable*, that, and that ONLY the Spirit supplies. Now, that the Spirit does *not* furnish the *Matter* or *Words* of our prayers, appears from the very Text, where we are told, that the Assistance which it affords, is its *Intercession*, which is not made in Words, but *with groanings that cannot be uttered.* Thus You see this Text is so far from serving their purpose, that it rather proves against them; seeing it plainly supposeth that Men use their Endeavours: Now what Endeavours can they use, but to prepare the *Matter*, to reduce it to a *Form*, and to carry along with them as much *Fervency* and *Sincerity* as they can, AND THEN THE HOLY GHOST DOES IN AN INEFFABLE MANNER INTERCEED FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE WHOLE. Thus he.

Here is Doctrine for Christians with a Witness. First an absolute Denial of all Internal Operation of the Spirit of God in us; not only in Opposition to the Scripture, which he appears to have no Regard to; but in direct Contradiction to the *English* Liturgy which teaches * that *all Holy Desires proceed from God.* Secondly, An inverting the Office of the Persons in the Sacred Trinity, by making

making the Holy Ghost our Mediator for *Acceptance* instead of Christ. Hear Dr *Whitby* on the forecited Text. ' The Spirit of God, *saieth* He, is said to *interceed* for us, not as an *Advocate* or Mediator betwixt God and us, that being the office of our great High Priest, but as an *Exciter* or *Director* of us in our Addresses to God, to render them for MATTER according to the Will of God, and for MANNER fervent and effectual. Thus He in a peremptor Contradiction to Mr *Rhind's* Doctrine. To Dr *Whitby* let us join Bishop *Wilkins* (i) ' The Spirit of God, *saieth he*, must be our Guide and Assistance in this Duty. He must help our Infirmities and make Intercession for us. *Not that the Holy Ghost is our Mediator of Intercession*, that is properly the Office of the Son, who is therefore stil'd our *Advocate*. *There is one Mediator betwixt God and Man the Man Christ Jesus*. 'Tis He only that in Respect of His Merits and Sufferings does make Intercession for us Rom. VIII. 34. But now, because the Spirit of God does *excite* our Hearts to pray, and *infuse* in us Holy Desires, *stirring us up to*, and *instructing us in* this Duty, therefore he is said to *interceed* for us. Thus he, And thus all the Christian World ever taught.

And thus now I have laid out this Particular with all Fairness. * Mr *Rhind's* Doctrine is evidently Heretical and subversive of the Gospel: And I lay it before the *Episcopal* Clergy for their Censure. If they shall in a publick Manner disown it, it is not to be imputed to them, nor any more Noise to be made about it. But if not, they must excuse us, if we look upon them as Abettors of the avowed Enemies of Christianity.

Whatever else Mr *Rhind* has advanced on this Head is like the Talk of a Man troubled with a *Delirium*. Such as *first*, ' that Means are useless if our Prayers be immediately inspired, and that they ought to be registrated among the infallible Dictates of the Spirit which the *Modern Prophets* pretended to. p. 171, 172. For, the *Presbyterians* neither do, nor ever did pretend to an unerring Dictament of the Spirit in their Prayers, but to such gracious *Infusions*, *Excitations* and *Directions*, in the Use of Means, both as to the *Matter* and *Manner* of our prayers, as we have just now heard Dr *Whitby* and Bishop *Wilkins* pleading for. And as to the *Modern Prophets*, he ought, out of Respect

to his own Party, to have been silent about them, seeing all their Profelyts were gain'd from the *Episcopal* Side, according to the best Information I can have. Of the same Nature is what he says. 2^{dly}, 'That the *Presbyterians* can have no Title to the Influences of the Spirit, because they have departed from the Communion of the Church p. 172. I hope indeed there is no *Presbyterian* within the Communion of Mr *Rhind's* Church. For, to deny the Assistance of the Spirit as to the *Matter* and *Manner* of our Prayers, making them the Fruit of our own Endeavours allenary; and to assign to the *Spirit* the Office (which is *Christ's* peculiar) of *pleading* with God for his *Acceptance* of our Prayers; is, I affirm, such execrable Doctrine, as is inconsistent with the Possibility of Salvation, if continued in. To as good Purpose is what he adds. 3^{dly}, 'That the *Presbyterians* praise God by certain Forms, without Regard to the stinting of the Spirit, when 'tis undeniable that the Spirit can as freely dictate *Praises* as *Prayers*, and *Metre* as well as *Prose*. p. 173. Right, he can do so. And has he not dictated the *Matter* of the *Psalms*? And does he not assist as to the *Manner*, I mean, with *Fervency* and *Sincerity* in singing 'em? And is not every Minister in his Congregation left at Freedom to pitch upon such a Portion of 'em, for the Spiritual Solace of his People, as the Spirit of God, in the Use of rational Consideration, suggests to him to be most suitable to their Case? Here is all the Freedom was ever pleaded for by the *Presbyterians*. Whereas by the *Liturgy* Ministers are obliged to such particular *Psalms* according to the Day of the Month appointed by the Book, how unsuitable soever they may be to the present Case of the Congregation. 4^{thly}, He wou'd know of his Adversaries what they understand by *stinting the Spirit*. p. 173. He had Reason indeed to ask them, because 'tis very plain he himself knew not. I can impute it to nothing but Vapours, that he imagines they constitute the Spirit of Prayer in a Freedom of *Changing the Phrases*, and *transposing the Petitions*. But I shall explain the Matter to him by some few Instances which may make it easily understood. A Minister, I shall suppose, is to meet with his Congregation for worshipping God. Before he comes forth to them, he has taken Pains to get his Soul impressed with a deep Sense of the particular Sins and Wants of the People committed to his Charge. When he is come to Church; according to the *Presbyterian* Way, he is at Freedom in Prayer to break out into a particular Confession of their Sins with

with their *particular* Aggravations; and to make a *particular* Representation of their Case before God, and to use such pleadings with him for them, as are warranted or preceded in Scripture in the like Case. This is surely the most *reasonable Service*, most acceptable to God, and most likely to affect & edifie both the Minister and People. But on the other Hand, by the *Liturgick* Way a Minister must not so much as venture on any Thing of this, but is obliged to content himself with that dry and *general* Confession which is in the Book, and that under all the Pains of *Nonconformity*; which, how heavy they are, many Thousands have felt, in the Ruin of all their Worldly Concerns. Is not this a *Stinting of the Spirit* with a Witness.

Cant is a Term of Reproach, which the *Episcopalians* (Mr *Rhind* too among the rest p. 190. 197.) never fail to twit the *Presbyterian's* with. This they improve so mightily upon, that if some Young Fellow of 'em, when setting out into the World, have pick'd up that word any where at a Conversation over a Bottle, the empty Thing concludes himself stock'd, and strait Commences both *Wit* and *Atheist* upon it; and thenceforth pronounces all serious Piety especially the *Presbyterian* prayers to be *CANT*; because forsooth, there was one Mr *Cant* once a *Presbyterian* Minister at *Aberdeen*. I confess it is not through any Defect of Duncery, any more than of Debauchery, that they talk at this Rate. *Cant* is truly a Term borrowed from the *Begging* Trade. When the idle feigned Fellows are got into, and Chime over to every Passenger, a Rote of Words, not which the sense of Want suggests; but which they have contrived and Conn'd for their purpose. This is indeed *Cant*, and there is too much Cause to impute this to the *Liturgick* Worship, where they still Tone over the self same thing the self same Way, whatever Disposition they find their Souls in. But on no Account can it be charged on the *Presbyterian* Way, even in *Sense* much less in *Justice*: For it is their *Case* and their *Want* which is their Prompter; and they think it a ridiculous thing to be obliged to Beg by Rule*. Yet further, that I may make Mr *Rhind* understand what the *Presbyterians*

L 1 2

sbyterians

* Men's moveat quippe, et Cantet si Nauseus a's'em
Protulerim? Cantas, cum scialla te in trabe pietum
Ex humero portes. Verum, nec nocte paratum
Plorabit, quime volet incurvasse quarela.

sbyterians mean by *stinting the Spirit*, I shall suppose the Minister has read the *Morning Prayers* in the *Liturgy* with his Congregation; and now he intends to *Preach* to them. Is it not reasonable that, ere he begin, he should put up a *particular* petition for Assistance, to himself in speaking, and to the people in hearing? There is no such petition in the prayers which he has read; and if he venture upon a prayer of his own; strait all the *Highflyers* are on his Back, and Dr South tells him, (*k*) *that it is a Senseless and absurd practice, and that the Canons and Constitutions of the Church are not responsible for it*; And he shall be sure not to escape without being branded for a *Puritan*. The same will his Fate be, if he adventure to pray over his Sermon *after* he has preached it. *We heartily desire* (said the Eleven Bishops and the other dignified Clergy at the *Savoy Conference*) (*l*), *that GREAT Care may be taken to suppress those private Conceptions of prayer BEFORE and AFTER Sermon* (*m*). Is not this to *stint the spirit*. Are *generall* petitions enough, as Mr Rhind would persuade us p. 174. when we are called to be *particular*? If so, then I propose this prayer as sufficient for the whole. *Almighty and Mercifull God, we beg that Thou may give us whatever thou knowest to be necessary and convenient for us, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.* I'll undertake, this prayer is as comprehensive, not only as *any*, but even as *all* the prayers of humane Composure in the *Liturgy*: Yet who would endure to be restricted to such a *General*? Yet further, when People are restricted to the *Liturgick* Way, not only *necessary* Petitions are omitted, but they are oftentimes forced upon Petitions which are either absurd in themselves, or against which their Conscience recoils, so that they cannot put them up in Faith. To give an Instance or two, When the Prince of *Orange* landed in *England* 1688, 'tis very well known the Body of the *Englisb* Clergy favoured his Attempt, yet for several Months after, they not only were obliged in Law, but actually did pray for *K. James*, begging in the Words of the *Liturgy*, that *God would confound the Devices of his Enemies*. Once more, When Prince *George* of *Denmark* Her Majesty's Husband was dead, the Clergy continued as formerly to pray for Issue

[k] Sermon. Vol. II. on Eccles. V. 2.
Dialogue on the Liturgy. p. 6. 7.

[l] See the Conference p. 57.

[m] See second

to her Majesty, till that Clause of the *Liturgy* was discharged by an Order of the *Council*. This is no Secret, for we had it in the Publick News Prints. Were these Petitions either reasonable or decent? I hope by this Time Mr. *Rhind* understands what the Presbyterians mean, when they say the *Spirit is stinted* by Forms. 5thly, He Objects p. 174. that ' if the preparing the Substance of ' a Prayer does *stint the Spirit*, then are they who are obliged to ' follow the *Westminster Directory*, no less guilty than they who use ' the *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*. 'Tis answered. No Man is obliged to follow the *Westminster Directory* so closely, but that he may leave out some of the Petitions mentioned in it, or insert others as in prudence he shall think meet. Thus It self directs, ' We ' judge this to be a Convenient Order, in the Ordinary publick ' Prayers, yet so, as the Minister may defer (as in prudence he ' shall think meet) some part of these petitions, till after his Ser- ' mon, or offer up to God some of the Thanksgivings hereafter ap- ' pointed in his prayer before his Sermon. And as to the very Words in the *Directory*, the Minister is not at all restricted to them, but only to call upon the Lord to this Effect. But Mr. *Rhind* was resolved to be throughout Chimerical. Lastly, He objects p. 176. ' that all publick Prayers are unavoidably Forms to the Congrega- ' tion, and therefore *stint the Spirit* as much as any *Liturgy* in the World. Senseless Stuff! The people meet in the Congregation not to offer up their own *Separate* Prayers, but to join with the Minister, who is their Mouth to God in *prayer*, as he is God's Mouth to them in *Preaching*. There is then Nothing required of them, in that Case, but Fervency and Sincerity in joining with the petitions that are put up for them; nor does the Spirit operate otherwise, in that Case, than to help them to such Sincerity and Fervency, nor at all to suggest to them Prayers of their own distinct from the publick Prayers.

Thus now I have gone through Mr. *Rhina's* Arguments which tho' contemptible in the last Degree, yet are not only the *best*, but indeed the *whole* of what the party have to offer. They are either ignorant of, or willfully mistake the *Presbyterian* principles concerning prayer, and then instead of disputing against them, they dispute against their own Frantick Notions. They still dispute as we heard Mr. *Rhind* doing against the *Infallible Inspiration* of the Spirit in
prayer.

Prayer. But such as cannot conceive, how one may be assisted by the Spirit either in Prayer, or indeed in any Holy Exercise, without being under his *infallible Conduct* so as to be kept altogether from Error or Imperfection, such, I say, who cannot conceive this are beyond arguing with, and should be left to themselves. That every good Man is acted by the Spirit of God, is the common Belief of the whole Christian World. But if any Man shou'd deny this, and alledge that it wou'd follow thence, that every good Man were perfect and infallible, what else shou'd people do but pity and pray for the foolish Objector? How often does the Church of *England* Her self pray for *INSPIRATION*? Thus in the Collect before the Communion, *Cleanse the Thoughts of our Hearts by the INSPIRATION of Thy Holy Spirit*. Thus in the Collect on the fifth Sunday after *Easter*, *Grant to us thy humble Servants, that by Thy holy INSPIRATION we may think those things that be Good*. Thus in the prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church Militant-----*Beseeching Thee to INSPIRE continually the Universal Church with the Spirit of Truth*. Does any Body think that those prayers import an *Infallible Guidance and Assistance*? As little do the Presbyterians mean, that They are under an *Infallible Conduct*, when They say Their prayers are *Inspired*. But our *Scotch Episcopal Clergy* neither know the scriptures nor indeed the *English Liturgy* which they are so fond of. Let them tell us in what Sense they understand what is said in the *Preamble* to the Liturgy, viz. *That by an Uniform Agreement it was concluded on BY THE AID OF THE HOLY GHOST*, and then we shall easily explain to them how our Prayers are *Inspired*.

I shall conclude my Defence of *CONCEIVED Prayer* (which I have hitherto call'd *Extemporary*, only in Compliance with Mr. *Rhina's* Phrase) with the Words of Bishop *Wilkins*, who at once shews the Meanness of Mr. *Rhina's* Objections, and reproves the Prophaneness of his Spirit (n).

‘ But now, in the *Second Place*, for any one so to sit down and satisfy himself with this *Book-Prayer*, or some *prescript Form*, as to go no farther, this were still to remain in his Infancy, and not
to

' to grow up in his new Nature: This would be, as if a Man
 ' who had *once* need of Crutches, shou'd *always* afterwards make
 ' use of them, and so *necessitate* himself to a continual Impotence.
 ' 'Tis the Duty of every Christian to grow and encrease in all the
 ' parts of Christianity, as well *Gifts* as *Graces*; to exercise and im-
 ' prove every Holy Gift, and not to stifle any of those Abilities
 ' wherewith God hath endued them: Now how can a Man be
 ' said to live suitable unto these Rules, who does not put forth
 ' himself in some Attempts and Endeavours of this Kind? And
 ' then besides, how can such a Man suit his Desires unto several
 ' Emergencies? What one saies of *Counsel* to be had from Books,
 ' may be fitly applyed to this *Prayer* by Book; that it is commonly
 ' of it self, something *Flat* and *Dead*, floating for the most part too
 ' much in *Generalities*, and not *particular* enough for each several
 ' Occasion. There is not that Life and Vigour in it to engage the
 ' Affections, as when it proceeds immediatly from the Soul it self,
 ' and is the Natural Expression of those particulars whereof we
 ' are most sensible. And if it be a Fault not to strive and labour
 ' after this Gift, much more is it to *jeer* and *despise* it by the Name
 ' of *ex Tempore Prayer*, and praying *by the Spirit*; which Expressi-
 ' ons (as they are frequently used by some Men by Way of Re-
 ' proach) are for the most part a Sign of a * *Prophane*
 ' Heart, and such as are *altogether* Strangers from the * N. B. -
 ' Power and Comfort of this Duty. Thus Bishop *Wil-*
kins. And had others, more nearly concerned, treated Mr. *Rhind*
 with the same Freedom, he had never publish'd such a Book, so
 much to the Scandal of Religion and the Shame of the Party He
 writes for.

S E C T. II.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Objections against the Presbyterian Doctrine concerning the Sacraments, and his Exceptions against their Manner of Dispensing them, are considered, From P. 177. to P. 185.

TO Begin with *Baptism*. Concerning this Mr *Rhind* asserts roundly and without Fear *First*, That Baptism with Water is *indispensibly* Necessary, seeing without it none can reasonably expect to be baptized with the Spirit, or that they shall enter into the Kingdom of God, nay that, if God's extraordinary Mercy does not interpose, they shall be damned without it. *Secondly*, That the Water is the Vehicle of the Spirit, and that the inward Grace does *always* accompany the outward Mean, *when it encounters with no Renitency in the Recipient*. Having laid down these Principles, He objects *First*, That the *Presbyterians* teach that Baptism is of no Efficacy. *Secondly*, That they suffer Children to die without it. *Thirdly*, That their *Confession of Faith*, whereof some Doctrines are dubious and some impious and false, is the Creed into which they baptize. *Fourthly*, That the genuine *Presbyterians* urge the Obligation of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, and press it as a necessary Condition of the Child's Admission to Baptism.

As for his *First* Assertion. That *Baptism with Water* is *indispensibly necessary*, it is directly Popish. The *Presbyterians* willingly grant that the Contempt or willfull Neglect of Baptism is damnable, I mean, in an adult Person, or to the Parent who neglects to procure it for his Child. But that the meer Want of it is damnable to the Child, or to an adult Person when he cannot have it in an orderly Way

Way, that is, according to Christ's Institution, this I affirm is a damnable Error, an Error which gives one the most unworthy Notions of God, an Error which hath been the fruitfull Mother of many others and of the most scandalous Practices. It is to this Error the *Limbus Infantum* owes its Being, to this is owing the Practice of Lay Baptism by Women as well as Men in the Church of England; yea by Jews, Turks and Pagans, as well as by Christians, as is allowed in the Church of Rome. It is to this Error these hasty Baptisms are owing, where there is no Profession by, no Sponson for the Party baptized; than which there can hardly be a greater Scandal on the Christian Religion. For, it exposes that Holy Mystery to the same Reproaches wherewith the Heathen *Lustrations* were so justly loaded *. But I need not insist on this. The excellent *Forbes a Corse* before cited has sufficiently exposed that execrable Doctrine at large in Six Chapters (o). The Church of Rome has found it too hard for her to answer him on that Head. But indeed there is nothing too hard for our Modern *Episcopalians*, who do all their Business by Assertion, Proof being too great a Drudgery.

Mr *Rhina's* Second Assertion is like unto the First. When the Council of Trent decreed (p) That the Sacraments confer Grace *non ponentibus Obicem*, it gave Scandal to all the World: For it turns these sacred Ordinances into meer Charms. Yet Mr *Rhind* has new vamped it, requiring Nothing else but a *Non-Repentency* in the Recipient, whereas the Scripture expressly requires the *positive* Qualifications of faith and Repentance. Yea, the *Scots* Episcopal Liturgy supposes these Qualifications even in Infants. Thus in the Catechism.

Q. What is required of Persons to be baptized?

Ans. Repentance, whereby they forsake Sin, and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the Promises of God, made to them in the Sacrament.

Q. Why then are Infants baptized, when by Reason of their tender Age They cannot PERFORM them? M m Ans.

* Omne n fas, omnemque mali purgamine causam

Credabant nostri tollere posse Senes.

Gracia principium moris fuit: illa nocentes

Impia lustratos ponere facta putat.

Ab nimium facies, qui tristia crimina cadis

Fluminea tolli posse putatis aqua.

Ovid. Fast. Lib. II.

[e] Instruct. Hist. Theol. Lib. X. Cap. VI. VII. VIII. IX. X. XI. [p] Can. VI. De Sacramentis in Genere.

Ans. Yes: They do PERFORM them by their Sureties; who promise and vow them both, in their Names: Which when they come to Age, themselves are bound to perform.

Thus also it was in the *English* Liturgy, but after the *Restoration* they altered it, and dash'd out the Word PERFORM in the beginning of the answer to the last Question. And they had good Reason to do so: For a vicarious Performance of Faith and Repentance is a pretty dark Mystery. I'm sure it would be Nonsense in a *Presbyterian*; and yet the Alteration they have made mends not the Matter a Whit. But that is not it we are at present concern'd about, 'tis plain that the Doctrine of *Non-Remitency* is a Stranger to the Scriptures. But Mr Rhind was for brushing forward in his Chat; displease whom he will, he has the Church of Rome on his side. So much for his *Assertions*. Next to his *Objections*.

First, He objects, That the *Presbyterians* teach that *Baptism is of no Efficacy* p. 178. What Answer is to be given to this? None so proper as that of the *Psalmist*, *What shall be given unto thee? Or what shall be done unto Thee, thou false Tongue? Sharp Arrows of the Mighty, with Coals of Juniper.* Pf. CXX. 3, 4. Hear the *Presbyterians* declare themselves in their *Confession of Faith* (q). 'The Efficacy of Baptism is not tyed to that Moment of Time wherein it is administred: Yet, notwithstanding by the Right Use of this Ordinance, the Grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of Age, or Infants) as that Grace belongeth unto, according to the Counsel of God's own Will, in his appointed Time. The *Presbyterians* have no where declared that any baptized Infants are Damned: But to assert, as the *English* Liturgy does (r), 'That Children which are baptized dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly saved, is so far from being certain by *God's Word*, that I affirm there is not one Title from the Beginning of *Genesis* to the End of the *Revelation* to support it. God has his own Way of dealing with

[q] Chap. XXVIII Sect. 6. [r] Penult Rubrick in the Office for publick Baptism of Infants.

with Infants, which we are sure is most Just and Holy. But it is *secret* to us. And therefore to determine, that all that die in that State unbaptiz'd are damn'd, and that all that are Baptized are undoubtedly saved, is very high Presumption. 'Tis a very usual Thing among the Popish Missionaries to Baptize the Infants of the native *Indians* Clancularly, without the Knowledge or Consent of their Parents, when They can find any secret Occasion. Will any Protestant determine, that such of them thus baptized as die in their Infant State are therefore *undoubtedly* saved? Must the absurd and unwarrantable Action of a vagrant Fellow conclude God as to the Disposal of His Creatures? This is such nonsensical Doctrine as is fit only for the Church of *Rome* which God has given up to Delusions.

Secondly, He objects, ' That the *Presbyterians* cruelly suffer wretched Children to die without Baptism, than which Nothing can be more opposite to the Doctrine of Christ who expressly says *John III. 5.* ' That except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Might not one have expected, that he wou'd have adduced to many Instances as might have made his Charge *presumably* true, and justified it so far, as that it might affect the Body of the *Presbyterians*? Nay but he has not even offered at so much as one Instance. 'Tis very true *Presbyterian* Ministers will not baptize Children in a Hurry, nor content themselves with pronouncing the solemn Words without a previous Profession or Sponson. And in this both Scripture and Reason justify them. They are still ready to baptize Children, when 'tis desired, in a regular and orderly Way: But, when it cannot be done but in such a Manner as represents Baptism as a Charm, and exposes the Christian Mysteries to the Contempt and Reproach of proane Persons; they don't think it lawfull for them to dispencc it, and herein they are Justified by Bishop *Hall* (s) who expressly says, *that as Baptism is not to be negligently deferred, so 'tis not to be superstitiously hastened.* But, which is of much more Import, they are very sure that, in such a Case, the Want of Baptism is not prejudicial to the Salvation of the Child;

M m 2

for

For it were most horrid to think, that a Mercifull God shou'd damn Infants for what was not their own Fault in any Respect.

As for that Text which Mr *Rhind* insists on *Except a Man be born* &c it is most ridiculously applyed in this Case. For *that*, as well as all Scripture Declarations of the like Nature are calculated, not for Infants, but for adult Persons and such as are come to the Exercise of their Reason. To such it is not only necessary (as it is also to Infants) that they be internally sanctified, but also that they make an outward Profession by receiving Baptism. For Christ will own none for his Disciples that are ashamed of Him before Men. Plainly, the Import of that Text may be easily gathered from the Occasion of it. *Nicodemus* was a discreet Person, and had a honourable Opinion of our Saviour, that He was a *Teacher come from God*. But then he had come to Jesus *by Night*, which argued that he was timorous, and loath to profess publicly the inward Sentiments of his Soul. Wherefore Christ knowing his weak Side, and understanding the Reason of his *Night Visit*, instantly and at first Dash tells him the Usefulness of internal Perswasion without an open Profession; that it was necessary he should be *born again* (which is a Phrase taken from the Jewish Doctrine about *Proselytism*) not only of the Spirit by Sanctification and the renewing of the inner Man, but of *Water* too by an open and undaunted Profession before the World, of which Baptism wou'd be the Badge and Token, without which latter he cou'd not own him for His Disciple, any more than without the former. This is the plain Sense of that Text; but what Relation has this to Infant Baptism, which is not founded upon that Text, nor indeed reasonably can be, but upon other Scripture Grounds which I need not now mention. And that the said Text does not prove the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptism, I shall produce the Judgment of two Bishops. The First is of *Hopkins* late Bishop of *London-Derry* in his Sermon upon it. Having narrated that Comment upon it which Mr *Rhind* has given us, He adds: ' But this Opinion is unwarrantable, and contrary to the received Judgment of the Church in the Primitive Times, who, if they had thought the baptismal Regeneration was indispensibly necessary to Salvation, wou'd not certainly have stinted and confin'd the Administration of it only to two Times of the Year *Easter* and *Pentecost*,

‘*Pentecost*, thereby to bring upon themselves the Blood of their Souls that should in that *Interim* have died without Baptism. Thus he. The other is *Joseph Hall* Bishop of *Exeter* in his Letter, to the Lady *Honoria Hay*, just before cited on the Margin. Throughout all that Epistle, which I recommend to the Reader’s Perusal, he disputes with the greatest Force of Reason against that Opinion of the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptism, and in Terms calls it *The hard Sentence of a Bloody Religion*.

All this Doctrine of the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptism is founded upon another false Doctrine licked up by Mr *Rhind*, viz. That the Water is the Vehicle of the Spirit, and that the very act of Baptism carries *always* with it an inward Regeneration, and that none can have the Spirit *without* or *before* Baptism. This is plainly contrary to the whole Tenor of the Scripture, and tho’ it was too early entertained by some of the *Fathers*, yet, ’tis certain it was not the received Doctrine of the Primitive Church; as, besides many particular Testimonies that might be adduced, will appear from these *three* general Considerations.

First, It was a very prevailing Custom among them to delay their Baptism till they were *in extremis*. In some indeed this proceeded from a Tincture of the *Novatian* Heresy: But others, for Instance, *Constantine* the Great who was no *Novatian*, delayed it upon other Considerations. But now, if Christians had believed that they cou’d not have the Spirit, nor be internally regenerated, nor be Members of Christ or the Children of God till they were made such in Baptism, and that they shou’d certainly become such in Baptism; wou’d all the World have been able to perswade them to delay it? ’Tis very hard to think so.

Secondly, The same appears from the History of the *Catechumens*. During that State they were Probationers, not only as to their Knowledge, but likewise their Piety and Manners; and were obliged, before they cou’d be admitted to Baptism to give moral Evidence of the Grace of God in their Hearts, in a Word to have every Thing in Christianity, but the Solemn Investiture, which both confirmed what they had, and entitled Them to further Degrees.

Thirdly, Tho’ Infant Baptism was still allowed as *lawfull* in the Catholick

Catholick Church, yet it did not *universally* obtain for several Centuries; so that (If I am not much mistaken) the *Necessity* thereof was not asserted before the Council of *Carthage* in the Year 418. Certainly had Christians believed, that the Water is the Vehicle of the Spirit, and that we cannot be spiritually Regenerated *without* it or *before* it, and that in the very Act of it we are spiritually Regenerated, they wou'd never have omitted it. I do not adduce this to justify them in that Omission, but only thereby to shew that Mr. *Rhind's* Doctrine was not the Belief of the Primitive Church as he without proof alledges.

In a Word Faith and Repentance are prerrequired to Baptism in *adult* Persons at least. If they can have Faith and Repentance without the Spirit and spiritual Regeneration, which is not obtain'd (as They say) but in and by Baptism, I don't see why They may not go to Heaven without the Spirit or spiritual Regeneration. For I'm sure Repentance towards God and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ is the Sum of the Gospel. But Enough of this for this Time.

Thirdly, Mr. *Rhind* objects, ' That the *Confession of Faith*, whereof some Doctrines are dubious, some Impious and false, is the Creed into which the *Presbyterians* baptize. I answer *1st*, That however dubious, false and impious these Doctrines are, yet I have already proved them to be the Doctrines of the Catholick Church of Christ. *2dly*, 'Tis false that the *Confession of Faith* is the Creed into which They baptize. They baptize into the Belief of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and only declaratively assert Their *Confession of Faith* to be agreeable thereto. *3dly*, Suppose They did baptize into their *Confession of Faith*, why is not that as lawfull as baptizing into the *Apostle's Creed*? Are they not both humane Compossures? Or does he dream that the Apostles themselves were the Authors of it? But this only *ad Hominem*. For my own Part I assert, that it is unlawfull to baptize into the Belief of any human Composure otherwise than as I have explain'd above.

Lastly, He Objects, ' That the genuine *Presbyterians* press the Obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant as a necessary Condition of the Child's Admission to Baptism. 'Tis denied, and Mr.

Rhind

Rhind is challenged to prove it. I affirm further, that there is no *Presbyterian* Minister in the Nation who will refuse to baptize in the Terms of the *Directory*, among which Terms there is not so much as *Mention* of the *Solemn League and Covenant*. Mr. *Rhind* is challenged to disprove this if he can. So much for Baptism.

I proceed next to consider his Objections relating to the other Sacrament *viz.* The *Lord's Supper*. As to this he Objects upon. I. The *Infrequency* of it among the *Presbyterians*. II. The *Indecency* wherewith They celebrate it. III. The hard Terms upon which They admit to it. IV. That it is indeed no Sacrament at all as dispensed by them. Of these in Order.

I. He objects upon the *Infrequency* of the *Lord's Supper* among the *Presbyterians*. In the *Presbyterian Communion*, saith he p. 182, *my Lot might fall in a Place where the Holy Eucharist would not be administered once in a Dozen of Years*. For answer. 1st, Has he given Instance of any such Place? No, not so much as one. 2^{dly}, Suppose he had given one, two, three, nay even a Score of Instances, were the Constitution to be charged with that? There are, no doubt, careless Ministers among the *Presbyterians*, as well as in other Communions, but none but a mean malicious Soul will load the whole Body with the Defects of a few. 3^{dly}, Was the *Episcopal* Clergy, during their Reign before the *Revolution*, less guilty than the *Presbyterians* are? I am content it be put to a Trial through the Nation. And, to begin the Work; within the Presbytry of *Dumbarton*, where I serve, there are *Seventeen* Parishes. I affirm that in these *Seventeen* Parishes taken complexly, the better to mend the worse, the Communion has been celebrated *threetimes oftner* within these Dozen Years last by past, than it was during the whole twenty eight Years under the *Episcopal* Reign before the *Revolution*. 4^{thly}, Is the Church of *England*, to which Mr. *Rhind* is gone over, innocent in this Particular. Hear Dr *Wetenhall* late Bishop of *Kilmore* in his Book entitled *Due frequency of the Lord's Supper*, dedicated to Her Majesty, and printed at *Edinburgh* 1706. 'Amongst the Laws of our Church' (saith he in his Dedication) 'as there is none perhaps more excellent and truly Christian, than those touching the Lord's Supper; so it is hard to assign ANY MORE NEGLECTED, than the

‘ the Rubricks which injoin Due Frequency of it; and the Neglect
 ‘ is not only in COUNTRY-PARISHES, but even in some GREAT-
 ‘ ER CHURCHES. Thus the Bishop. Why then wou’d Mr *Rhind*
 leap out of the Frying Pan into the Fire? Why wou’d he charge
 the *Presbyterians* with that whereof his Brethren both in *Scotland* and
England have been so notoriously guilty? But, an impudent Way
 of writing is become the Characteristick of the modern *Episcopal*
 Authors.

II. He objects upon the *Indecency* wherewith the Lord’s Supper
 is celebrated among the *Presbyterians*. Wherein lyes this Indecency?
 ‘ Why, *saieth* he p. 182, the Convocation has more of the Confusi-
 ‘ on of a Fair, than of the order and Decency of a religious As-
 ‘ sembly. And how can it otherwise be, when they not only al-
 ‘ low, but encourage, on these Occasions, such Rendevouzes of the
 ‘ promiscuous Rabble, who desert their own Churches, to the great
 ‘ Hinderance of their Devotion who communicate, and Scandal too,
 ‘ when they see so many professed Christians neglect their Lords
 ‘ expresse Command of keeping up the Memorial of his Death and
 ‘ Passion for them. For Answer. *1st*, Tis true, Communicants
 have been very numerous among the *Presbyterians* ever since the
Revolution. Not only the Inhabitants of the Parish in which the
 Communion is celebrated, but many from the neighbouring Pa-
 rishes, attested by their respective Ministers, have usually joined
 in it; But is the Numerousness of Communicants either a Fault or an
 Indecency? So far from it, that cou’d the whole Christian Church
 communicate at once, it wou’d be so much the more of the Nature
 of a *Communion*, and tend so much the more to the Honour of our
 Blessed Saviour. But this Objection of Mr *Rhind*’s proceeds from
Silliness, or, which is the same Thing, from Envy; because during
 the *Episcopal* Government, in many Places the Minister and his Family,
 with the *Sexton* and his, and perhaps two or three more made up the
 whole Communicants. *2dly*, Tis true likewise, that there are many
 others present oftimes besides those that Communicate. But where is the
 Harm of this? Does it *hinder* the Devotion of the Communicants, that
 others are looking on them? Is it not rather an Engagement upon Them
 to carry Themselves with the more solemn Gravity? Or how can
 the presence of such as do not communicate be a *Scandal* to those
 that do? For, tho’ They do not communicate at *that* time, it
 cannot

cannot infer a Neglect of our Lord's Command, seeing people are not at *all* Times in a Frame for Communicating. And when a Minister comes to assist his Neighbour Minister in dispensing the Communion, is it either Fault or Scandal for his People to follow him where they are furnished with Sermon? Is not this better than that they should loiter idly at Home all the Lord's Day, which wou'd be both a Sin in them, and give Scandal to others? But this Objection of his was indeed too mean to have been noticed.

I wou'd only ask Mr *Rhind* if there are not incomparably greater Indecencies in the Way of the Church of *England*, to which he has *separated*. Is it possible there can be a greater Scandal, than to see a known Rake, not our for all Manner of Vice and Leudness, partaking of those holy Mysteries, before he has given the least Proof or Evidance of his Reformation? Yet this is every Day seen in the Church of *England*, and the Priests cannot, dare not help it.

I am not to alledge this without proof, that were the *Episcopal* Way of writing, which I don't envy. I shall give good and sufficient Documents of it. Mr *Bisset* a Presbyter of the Church of *England* has lately told us (t) ' of a Minister who was worried ' out of his Living and Life too, for denying the Communion to ' a Rake, before the Chancellor had excommunicated Him. Again tho' the Rubric require, that *so many as intend to be Partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their Names unto the Curate, at least sometime the day before*. Yet (says the same Author p. 51.) ' this is ' more than I ever knew done. I'm sure 'tis omitted in all or ' most of the *London Churches*. Yet further he tells us p. 54. that Dr F --- r was suspended for denying the Sacrament to such as only came to it as a Qualification to sell Ale and Brandy. Lastly, he tells us (*ibid*) of a Solution that was given to one (who doubted of coming to the Communion) in these Words *What Damage is it to pledge the Parson in a Cup of Wine, supposing only the Wine be good*. To Mr *Bisset* let us add the Author of *The Case of the Regale and Pontificat*, who is known to be most violently *High Church*. He roundly asserts p. 179 ' that an Action lies against the Minister who shall

N n

refuse

‘ refuse the Sacrament, to them who he knows, sees and hears in
 ‘ their Conversation and Principles, to be *never so much* unqualified.
 These are not *Presbyterian* Allegdances, but true *Episcopal* History.

III. He Objects p. 183. upon the *Hard Terms*, on which the
Presbyterians admit to the Communion, in Two Particulars. The
First, relating to the *Persons*, the *Second* to the *Posture*. *First*, As
 to the *Persons*. He alledges ‘ They will admit none who in the
 ‘ least favour the *Hierarchy* and *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*,
 ‘ but Excommunicate them with the vilest Blasphemers and Adul-
 terers. I ask him, Does he know any of the *Favourers* of the *Hi-*
erarchy and *Liturgy* who were ever denyed the Sacrament on that
 Account? Has he given any Instance of this? Not one. The
Presbyterians debarr none from Communion with *Them* in the Sa-
 crament, whose Principles and Life do not debarr Them from the
Christian Communion. They don’t look upon that Holy Ordinance
 as the distinguishing Badge of a Party or of any particular Com-
 munion of Christians; but as the Common Priviledge of all the
 Faithfull. And therefore They usually *Fence* the Lord’s Table in
 the Words of the Scripture I Cor. VI. 9. *Know ye not that the*
Uprighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived: Nei-
ther Fornicators, nor Idolaters--or some such like Scripture; or by go-
ing through the Ten Commandments. If Mr *Rhind* can name any *Pre-*
sbyterian Ministers who do otherwise, I suppose the Church will not
 think her self obliged to defend them. But, to exclude the Impenitent
 Breakers of any of the *Ten Commandments* from the Priviledge
 of Gospel Mysteries; to debarr those from the Lord’s Table, whom
 the Lord has, by the express Sentence of his Word, debarred out of
 the Kingdom of Heaven; is, what every one, who is not quite lost
 in Impiety, must own to be not only *lawfull* but a *Duty*.

This is sufficient to vindicate the *Presbyterians*: But who shall
 vindicate the Church of *England* Constitution? Mr *Rhind* is the most
 unlucky Man in the World. He has separated from the *Presbyteri-*
ans, upon a Chimerical Imagination of the Narrowness of their Cha-
 rity, that they admit none to the Communion, who in the least Fa-
 vour the *Hierarchy* and *Liturgy*; tho’ I suppose, there is no one
 living can bring Instance, where ever they refused it, on that
 Score, to any who desired it: And yet he has gone over to the
 Church of *England*, whose Divines, I mean the High-Church
 Party

Party of 'em, have declared in the strongest Terms, that they will not admit to it *Dissenters* or *Presbyterians*, whom they, in their equally wise and charitable Stile, call *NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICKS* at the same Time that they declare them to be *without the Church*. This is plain from the *Representation made by the lower House of Convocation to the Archbishops and Bishops* in the Month of December 1704. which the Reader may consult. And Mr. Barclay a Teacher of the Party, just come from London, has told his Mind very honestly in this Case. *I shall not, says he *, stick to say that I would not admit a NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICK, to Catholick Communion, till he recanted his Error, upon any consideration of Laws or Statutes.* I don't think but Mr. Barclay may be easie on that Head: For, I suppose, these *NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICKS* he speaks of will not give him much Trouble that Way. However, 'tis plain that *High-Church* has made the Communion a Badge of a Party. Was not Mr. Rhind then very well advised in going over to Her?

Secondly, As to the Posture. Mr. Rhind Objects, ' That the *Presbyterians* discharge that as Idolatrous, which others think most expressive of their inward Devotion, and debarr such from the Communion who wou'd use it. There is no doubt he means the Posture of *Kneeling* which is enjoined both by the *Scotch Episcopal* and the *English* Liturgies. And as to that, I here engage that no one *Presbyterian* Minister in the Nation shall, on that Account, refuse the Communion to any Person who can prove, or find any other to prove for him, either 1st, That that Posture was commanded by Christ. Or 2^{dly}, That it was used by the Apostles when They communicate in Christ's presence. Or 3^{dly}, That there is any Hint of its Usage in the New Testament Or 4^{thly}, That it was practised in the *Primitive Church* for the first *Five Centuries* at least after Christ. If none of these Things can be proved, as I am sure none of 'em can, and which every Writer on the *Episcopal* Side, of any Character, owns; why shou'd a Church break Her Order to gratify people in their Fancies, when 'tis confessed on all hands That, that Posture of *Kneeling* in the Sacrament has been used to the most Idolatrous Purposes. But Mr. Rhind alledges

N n 2

That

* Persuasive to the People of Scotland p. 167.

That such as are for that Posture are ready to attest the Searcher of Hearts that their Adoration is only directed to the one True and Living God, and His Son Jesus Christ, who is exalted at his Father's Right Hand. I answer. So is the Church of Rome ready to attest with the same Solemnity, That when She worships before the Picture of an Old Man, She does not worship the Image but God the Father by it. Yet who will excuse Her from Idolatry on that Account? And, which renders this Business of *Kneeling* still so much the more Suspicious, the late *Vindicator* of the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytry* is angry at the Rubric in the Liturgy which explains the Reason of Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and expressly says p. 79. That *neither hath the Church gained, nor can the Liturgy be said to have been made better by it.* But of this, and the dreadful Blunder in History he has committed to support this His Opinion, the Reader may perhaps hear more elsewhere. Yet further, why may not *Presbyterians* confine People to the *Table Posture* in the Sacrament which the *Episcopal* Divines themselves own was the Posture used by the Disciples in Christ's presence; when the Church of *England* confines People to the Posture of *Kneeling* for which there is no such Warrant, and appoints (v) every Minister to be suspended who wittingly gives the Communion to any that do not Kneel. Some may perhaps think that our *Scotch* Episcopalians are milder in that Matter, and indeed the above mention'd *Vindicator* of the *Fundamental Charter* would have us believe so. 'It is true, saith he p. 34. all communicate in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, kneeling; but I know none, that would deny the Sacrament to one, who could not without Scruple take it in that Posture. This is spoken with Abundance of Gravity, but with what Integrity let the Reader judge, when he considers 1st, That the Rubric in the *Scots* Episcopal Liturgy is as strict for kneeling as in the *English* Liturgy. And 2^{dly}, the *Scots* Episcopal Canon with Respect to that Posture is equally strict with the *English*, as may be seen both in the Canon itself and in *Clarendon's* History. Does not this shew their Spirit and Principles, tho' they yield at present to gull unwary People?

Before

Before I proceed to Mr *Rhind's* next Objection, there is one thing I cannot but take notice of. The *Episcopal* People have lately caused reprint the Liturgy which was sent down for *Scotland* by K. *Charles I.* and which began the Troubles Anno 1637. and I am informed that it is begun to be practised in some of their Meeting Houses instead of the *English* Liturgy. I think my self obliged in Charity to advertise People, * That that Liturgy, in N B the Office for the *Communion*, is a great deal worse than the *English*, and is plainly calculated for Begetting in People the Belief of the Corporal Presence. I shall at this Time give *three* Evidences of this. 1st, The *English* Liturgy has along *Rubric* declaring that, by the Posture of Kneeling no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporeal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood. The *Scots* Liturgy neither hath this Declaration, nor any Thing equivalent to it. 2^{dly}, the *English* Liturgy has a *Rubric* enjoining the Minister at the saying these Words in the Consecration, *When he had given Thanks He brake it*, to break the Bread. The *Scots* Liturgy has no such *Rubric*, nor any Appointment for breaking the Bread, any more than the *Roman Ritual* has. 3^{dly}, The *English* Liturgy enjoins the Minister to deliver the Bread to the People in Order, into their Hands all MEEKLY Kneeling, but the *Scots* Liturgy Words it, All HUMBLY Kneeling, that we might know They intended Adoration by that Posture, tho' they have not told, to what. I may possibly have Occasion, sometime after this, to shew particularly how much worse the *Scotch* Liturgy is than the *English*. But I thought it needfull to give these Hints now, because the *Episcopal* Clergy bear their People in Hand, that it is upon the Matter one and the same with the *English*. Particularly Mr *Smart*, one of their Teachers at *Edinburgh*, in his *short Discourse after Sermon*, commending the Service told them p 8. ' That ' there is no Material Difference between the *Scotish* and *English* ' Books of Common-Prayer; and that they differ as little as the ' *Scotish* and *English* Tongues. The first of which Assertions is false, as I have just now made out; and the latter Nonsense. For, so far as it follows the *English* in Matter, it is the very same in Words and Phrase; and no Wonder, for every Body knows it was of *English*.

English Birth, which herhaps made it take so ill with the Scots Air. But enough for Mr Smart, whose Name and Pamphlet are so very ill suited, and whose Character seems to be the very Reverse of the Apostle's Precept, *Being in Understanding a Child, howbeit in Malice he is a Man.*

IV. Mr Rhind objects p. 184. *That it is no Sacrament at all as dispensed by the Presbyterians. Pray why? There is, saith he, no due Application of the Form to the Matter. Very strange! They always read the Words of Institution either out of the Gospels or out of I Cor. XI. They have still, after our Lord's Example, a Prayer, Thanksgiving or Blessing of the Bread and Wine. Is not this a due Application of the Form to the Matter? 'No, saies 'Mr Rhind, the Form in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are 'the same Words by which our Lord did at first constitute the 'Sacrament viz. Take, eat, This is my Body, Do this in Remembrance 'of Me, and Drink ye of this Cup, for this is my Blood: Do this as 'oft as ye Drink it in Remembrance of Me. Very well. Do not the Presbyterians use these Words? Are they not in the Institution? 'Nay, but, saith he, if they be at all, they ought to be used in that 'Prayer by which they intend to consecrate the Elements? Is there any Precept for this in the Scripture? No. Any Example there? None. Any Evidence for the Practice, for at least four or five Centuries after Christ, in the Writings of the Fathers? Not any. The first Account we have of it is in the Books of the Sacraments (x) which pass under the Name of Ambrose, and are inserted among his Works. But I hope Mr. Rhind knows that these Books were not writ till some Ages after Ambrose's Death. And if Mr. Rhind's Doctrine be true, the Church of England Her self, for a long Time after abolishing the Mass had not the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For, that which is call'd the Prayer of Consecration, and in which the Words, Take, eat, this is my Body &c are, was not in K. Edward's first Liturgy: But instantly after the Prayer *We do not presume* &c. They proceeded to the Distribution. Nay, which is worst of all, we are assured from the Infalible Chair, that the Apostles used no other Prayer of Consecration but the Lord's Prayer.*

Prayer (y). And, I suppose ever Body knows that these Words, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, are not in that Prayer; and I think 'tis plain they were never intended to stand, in that Form, in any Prayer.

But now to gratifie Mr. *Rhind*, let us suppose that these Words shou'd be in the *Prayer of Consecration*, what follows? Why, *there*, saith he, *they are never once mentioned by the Presbyterians, and too often there is—Nothing equivalent to supply the Defect*. Did he ever consider what he said? Did he ever regard whether it was true or false? Is not every Minister *Directed* (z) upon that Occasion to pray, 'That God may sanctifie the Elements both of Bread and Wine, and so bleſs his own Ordinance, that we may receive by Faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us, and so to feed upon Him, that He may be one with us, and we with Him; that He may live in us and we in Him and to Him, who hath loved us and given himself for us' Is not here something equivalent to these Words? And can Mr *Rhind* name that Minister who does not pray either thus or to the same Purpose. But *proving* was none of his Business, all he had to do was to *Assert*.

I doubt not but after all this the Reader will think strange that Mr *Rhind* should have mentioned such an Objection. But the Case is plain, as he was avowedly *Popish* on the other Sacrament, so is he upon this; and wou'd insinuate upon People the very rational Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* to be effected by the pronouncing of these particular Words. And *Bellarmin* led the Way to him (a), so that he has indeed a Man of a very considerable Name for his Master.

Thus now I have gone through the *Episcopal* Objections against the Presbyterian Worship both as to *Prayers* and *Sacraments*. And I hope I have made it plain that there is not any one of the Things objected against, but what (so far as the Objection is true) is so far from being a Ground of *Separation*, that it is highly justifiable. But then, I must ask Mr *Rhind*, why, as he has given us the Grounds of his *sepa-*
rating

[y] *Gregor. Lib. 7. Ep. 63.* Oracionem autem Dominicam ideo max poſt preceſ dicimus, quia mos Apoſtolorum fuit, ut ad ipſam ſolummodo oracionem oblationis hoſtiæ conſecrarent.

[z] See the *Directory*. [a] De Sacram. Eucharist. Cap. 12. 13.

rating from the Presbyterian Worship, he has not also answered the other half of the Title of his Book, and justified the known Objections against the Worship of that Church whose Communion he pretends to have embraced. I have hinted at several of 'em as I came along, and they may be found more at length in some small Tracts lately published (b). Was there *Nothing* in the Liturgy that he startled at? I observe, the above cited Mr Smart p. 9. with much Assurance, bids his Audience read it all over, and among all the Prayers that are in it, see if there be any Prayer for the Dead, any worshipping of Images, any praying to Saints and Angels. I do not say that there are any Prayers for the Dead in it, but the Famous Author of the Case stated expressly says p. 189. there are, and proves it from the Order for the Burial of the Dead, and from the Prayer for the Church militant in the Communion Office. I do not say that there is any worshipping of Images in it. But I say, that many of the Common Prayer Books are filled with such Pictures as are condemn'd by the Homilies of the Church of England, yea and by the High Church Divines themselves; witness the last cited Author (supposed to be Dr Lestly) who, in his Conversation with the Roman Catholick Nobleman, tells him p. 135. *We abstain from the Pictures or Images of the Saints in our Churches, because they have been abused to Superstition and to avoid Offence.* Now if they are unlawfull in Churches, how is it possible they can be lawfull in Books appointed for the Church-Service? That same Author likewise in the same Place approves of the Zeal of Epiphanius, who finding a Linnen Cloth hung up in a Church Door (it is likely to keep out the Wind) whereon was a Picture of Christ or of some Saint, tore it and ordered a dead Corps to be buried in it. And lamented the Superstition he saw coming by these Pictures and Images then beginning to creep into the Church. Yet in England not only the Common Prayer Books, but even the Bible it self is filled with Pictures of Christ and the Saints; witness the Bible, printed London by Charles Bill, and the Executrix of Thomas Newcomb deceased Printers to the Queen's most excellent Majesty, 1708. Many Copies of which Impression are stuffed with such Pictures. Are they more innocent in the Bible, than upon a Linnen Cloth

[b] See the Dialogues between the Curate and the Countryman &c.

Cloth hanging in the Church Door? Yea, which is most abominable, there are several Obscene Pictures among 'em, particularly that of *Noah Uncovered* Gen. IX, *Lot and his two Daughters* Gen. XIX, *David and Bathsheba* 11 Sam. XI. Finally, I do not say there is any praying to Saints and Angels in the Common Prayer-Book. But I do say, that the consecrating Churches and Days to them, and the appointing particular *Offices* upon these Days to their Honour is the likeliest Thing to worshipping them that I can conceive. Besides, did Mr *Rhind's* nice and scrupulous Conscience never boggle at the *Ceremonies* of Human Invention? If the Church have Power to institute such, she has certainly Power to make a new Bible; For there is no such Power given her in the old one: Or if there is, certainly Protestants have been much in the Wrong to the Church of Rome. But I am not now to insist on these Things.

C H A P. V.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Fourth Reason for His Separating from the Presbyterians viz. That Their Spirit is diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel, is Examined, from P. 185. to the End.

THE Meaning of this Reason is, That Presbyterians are *incarnate Devils*: And the Intendment of it is, That all Persons who regard Conscience or Duty should hang out a *Bloody Flag* against 'em, and rise up with one accord, and spoil Their Goods and destroy

O o

stroy Their Persons; or, to speak in Dr. *Sacheverel's* much more elegant Stile, That the Bishops ought to thunder out the Ecclesiastical *Anathema's* against Them, and let any Power on Earth DARE reverse them; and that the People shou'd treat Them like *growing Mischiefs or infectious Plagues* *. This is indeed somewhat hard; but such is the *Episcopal* Charity, such are the mercifull principles wherewith they season Their new Converts, and such is the Usage we are to expect whenever the Sins of the Nation shall ripen to that Height as to provoke a Holy God to let in *Prelacy* upon it. But to make way for Particulars.

The *Presbyterians* neither are nor desire to be of those who *justify themselves*. They know and confess that there are *Tares* in Their Field as well as *Wheat*; and are sensible that They have the outmost Reason to cry with the Publican God *be mercifull to us Sinners*: But they think it a very shameless Thing in the *Episcopalians*, that *They* shou'd be the first who take up Stones to cast at Them: For, if the *Presbyterians* are great Sinners, I'm afraid (were that the Enquiry) the *Episcopalians* wou'd not be found to be very great *Saints*.

Our Saviour has given us an excellent Rule whereby to judge of Men's Spirits, *By their Fruits ye shall know Them*. I hope it needs not be deem'd a Reflection upon Them, or an immoderate flattering of our Selves to affirm, That the *Presbyterians*, generally speaking, are as *Devout* towards God, as frequent at Their Prayers; and, to outward Appearance (for God only knows the *Heart*.) as fervent in Them as the *Prelatists*. That They swear as seldom by the Name of God, as seldom tear open the Wounds of our Blessed Saviour, and as seldom imprecate Damnation upon Themselves or others as the *Episcopalians*. That They are as *Sober* and *Temperate*, go as seldom Drunk to Bed, are as mild in Their Carriage, as little given to Bullying or Blustering, as those of *High-Church*. That They are as *just* in Their Dealings with Their Neighbours, as open Handed to the Indigent, Their Poor as content, Their Rich as Humble, that They make as kind Husbands, as dutifull Wives; as carefull Parents and as obedient Children; as just Masters and as faithfull Servants, as those that live in Communion with the *Bishop*.

No.

No Man that's capable of making Observations, and is not quite lost to Ingenuity, will deny any of these Things. If I had said more, and affirmed, That ' Outrage, Murder and Assassinations are the ' known Practice of the *Highflyers*, as well as of the bigotted *Papists*, and that Their true Mother Tongue is, *I will not fail to cut ' your Throat by G-d*, it wou'd be thought hard; yet I might be very well excused, because Mr. *Bisset* a Presbyterian of the Church of *England* has said every Word of it before Me (c).

But, that Mr. *Rhind* may have all due Advantage against the *Presbyterians*; There are many Things he has charged Them with as very odious, which They not only freely confess, but boldly avow. Such as, for Instance. *First*, When He charges Them p. 189. That They believe *uncommon Measures of the Spirit of our Lord to be still necessary in the Work of Conversion*. The whole Catholick Church of Christ in all Ages still believed so; and I never suspected but that those of the *Episcopal* Communion had believed so too, till their new Disciple, whom, no doubt, They have instructed in all Their *Arcana*, inform'd Me otherwise. The Scripture tells us That *if any Man have not the Spirit of Christ He is none of His*: But to say, that this Spirit is *common* to all the Baptized Swearers, Cursers, Whoremongers and Adulterers through the Country, or that it is *Common* to such who live in a habitual Neglect of God or Unconcern'dness about their Souls and Eternal State, even tho' They are free of Scandalous Sins, This I judge to be the rankest Blasphemy. And if that Spirit be not *common* to all such Persons, then certainly it is an *uncommon* Spirit, or there are *uncommon* Measures thereof by which good and Pious Men are acted. *Secondly*, When He charges Them, *ibid*, with teaching That *the best Actions of Men before the Grace of God are but so many splendid Sins*. They own They do believe this, as we have seen before p. 10. the Church of *England* does. *Thirdly*, When he charges Them p. 195. That *They have a hidden Spice of Devotion in Their Tempers*. They are so far from being ashamed of this, that They pray, Would to God there were more of it. *Fourthly*, When He Charges Them *ibid*. That *upon the Commission of some Grievous Sin, They are affected with horrible Apprehensions*. The *Presbyterians*

own that, in that Case they ought to be so: For, they know that it exposes them to the Wrath of God; and believe, that *it is a fearful thing to fall into his Hands*. And tho', in that Case, *Their Souls* (that I may use Mr Rhind's Words p. 189.) *and commonly their Bodies too are in the greatest Disorder*, yet, they find that the Holy Men of God upon Scripture Record have been the same Way affected in the like Case. Thus David Psal. XXXVIII. 3, 4, 5. *There is no Soundness in my Flesh, because of thine Anger: Neither is there any Rest in my Bones, because of my Sin. For mine Iniquities are gone over mine Head: As an heavy Burden they are too heavy for me. My Wounds stink, and are corrupt: Because of my Foolishness.* In like Manner Heman Ps. LXXXVIII. 14, 15. *Lord why castest thou off my Soul? Why hidest Thou Thy Face from me? I am afflicted and ready to die, from my Youth up: While I suffer thy Terrors I am distracted.* The Bishop of Sarum, when instructing Ministers (d) how to deal with those of their People that are troubled in Mind, delivers himself thus. 'Some have committed enormous Sins, which kindle a Storm in their Consciences; and that ought to be cherished, till they have compleated a Repentance proportioned to the Nature and Degree of their Sin. Thus he, and thus every one, who is not quite abandon'd of God, wou'd teach. But Mr Rhind is not for having People affected with horrible Apprehensions upon the Commission of grievous Sins, much less for having these Apprehensions cherished till they are brought to Repentance. What Times are we refered to! Fifthly, When he charges them with a serious Air p. 202, with a peculiar Vehemency in Preaching, with a Preciseness of Conversation p. 204, with Discourses of the Love of God and Christ, and sweet Communion with the Father and the Son p. 205. The Presbyterians are, so far from being angry at this Charge, that They are sorry there is too little Ground for it; and They are heartily sorry that the Episcopal Clergy shou'd have had so little Regard to Piety, to the Honour of Religion, and to their own Reputation with all serious People, as to have cherished such a Book.

For besides these Instances, Is it possible any thing can be more Prophane, than to jest, as he does p. 194 &c, upon People's Exercise of Soul about their Eternal Concerns? Does not the Apostle command

mand *Timothy* 1 Ep. IV. 7 to *Exercise* Himself unto Godliness? Nay does he not command all Christians to *work out Their Salvation with FEAR and TREMBLING*? Has the *Episcopal* Party found out an *easier* Way of getting to Heaven? Is it possible any Thing can be more *prophane* than His charging *Presbyterians* p. 200. with resolving much of the Spirit of Religion into *Amorous Recumbancies*, and that *They think that They'll recommend Themselves to God after the very same Manner as to their Mistresses*? Was not this plainly intended to burlesque the Scripture? Is there any thing more familiar in the Scripture than to represent the Intercourse 'twixt God and the Soul by the Love of the *Bridegroom* and the *Bride*, of the *Husband* and the *Wife*? And if these study to recommend themselves to each other by an *Agrecableness* of Temper, and doing what They know will be well-pleasing to each other; is it culpable in the Soul to study to be assimilated to God, to be made *Partaker of the Divine Nature*, and to do what is well-pleasing in His sight? What are his *amorous Recumbancies* but a *Comical Phrase* whereby he designed to ridicule the Scripture Expression *Cant. VIII. 5. Leaning upon her Beloved*, which is literally the *Englisb* of it? Is it possible any thing cou'd be more *Prophane* than to strick at (as he does p. 190) the Work of Regeneration through the sides of the *Presbyterians*, whom he represents as talking of 'Their feeling the strugglings of the Babe of Grace in the *Plage* of bringing furth of Children, a passage, saith he, of the Prophet impertinently applied by them to this purpose? For was there ever any Christian that denyed the *Turning of the Soul to God* to be expressed in the Scripture by the *Birth of a Child*? Don't the *Arminians*, Does not the Church of *Rome* herself own this? And is there not the greatest Reason for it, if we consider either the *Difficulty* or the *Greatness* of the Change wrought upon the Soul thereby? Was there ever any Christian who applied that passage of the Prophet to any other purpose than that of the *Turning the soul to God*? Even *Grotius* Himself upon the place applys it thus, 'That *Ephraim* was not wise who so long delayed to repent and turn to God, and so to deliver Himself out of his Calamities. Cou'd there be any Thing more *Wicked* than to load the *Presbyterians* (as he does p. 197.) with the Scandal of *Major Weir* that Son of Perdition,

tion, *who*, saith he, *prayed those who joined with him into Raptures*: For, supposing it were true he had done so, which yet Mr Rhind and all his Party can never prove, how cou'd this affect the *Presbyterians*? Was there not a *Judas* among the Twelve Disciples? Can any Man prove but that He was equally gifted with the Rest? Yet who ever reproached either Christ or the College of the Apostles on his Account? Or who dare say but that God may employ such as are *Sons of Perdition* themselves as Instruments of Salvation to others? Cou'd any thing be more *Wicked* than to represent (as he does p. 190. 196) the *Presbyterians* as doing *Excommunication upon themselves through Despair*? There is no doubt but *Presbyterians* are liable to be oppressed with Melancholy as well as others, and that some in that Communion may sin themselves so far out of the Favour of God, as that in his just Judgment he may give them up as a Prey to Satan. But why shou'd the *Presbyterian Spirit* be reproached with this? Tho' the News Prints from London * tell us that, last Year, from the 16th of December 1712 to the 15th of December 1713, there were 34 Persons, within the Bills of Mortality, guilty of *Self-Murder*, will any Body therefore charge *Prelacy* and *Liturgy* therewith, tho' rampant there? Because I can name a famous Divine of the Church of England who trust'd up himself in his Canonical Belt, were it therefore just that I shou'd load the Spirit of the Church of England therewith?

Mr Rhind does indeed name Two Books viz. *Shepherd's sincere Convert*, and *Guthrie's Trial of a saving Interest in Christ*, as leading Men into that Course, or into deceitfull Hopes founded upon *Animal Impressions*. As for Mr Shepherd's Book, I am not so much concern'd about it, he was a Man that as I'm informed had *Episcopal Orders*, and was sometimes of *Emanuel College in Cambridge*. And I will not undertake to defend some *Peculiarities* he has in his Writings; let Mr Rhind, who is more obliged, do it at his best Leisure. But that there is any Thing in that Book that has the least Tendency either to drive Men into Despair, or to encourage them to bottom their Hopes of Heaven upon false Grounds, I absolutely deny, and challenge Mr
Rhind

* See the Evening Post Numb. 683.

Rhind to prove it: For hitherto he has acted as an avowed *Calumniator*, in not daring to cite so much as one Passage of the said Book for making good his Charge.

As for Mr *Guthrie*, he was a genuine *Presbyterian*, his Book is written in a most familiar Style, adapted to the *Capacity* of every common Reader, and to the *Feeling* of every good Christian: And God has so signally blessed it with Success, that no one Book can be named, written by any *Scots* Man of either Communion, that has been so instrumental in bringing off People from a Course either of Vice or Indifferency, and in engaging them to Thoughtfulness and a Concern about their Eternal Interest, as this has been. Can then Mr *Rhind* instance wherever the *Father of Lies* was guilty of a greater than what he has alledged against that Book? No. He was self-condemned, and therefore dar'd not adventure to cite so much as one *Line* of it for verifying his Charge. But we are not to wonder at this his Conduct. For when once a Man proclaims Hostility against *Piety* in the general, He finds it necessary to *blow* upon every serious Book that tends to promote it. I thought it necessary to give these Hints by the By, that the World may see what Men They are that *separate* from the *Presbyterians*, and are received by the *Episcopal* Party.

I am now to consider His Argument as he has laid it. *First*, As to its *Weight*, and then as to its *Truth*.

In the *First* Place as to its *Weight*. Supposing it were true, that the Spirit of the *Presbyterians* is *diametrically* opposite to that of the Gospel, wou'd that ALONE justify a Separation? Mr. *Rhind* affirms it would; and positively saies in his penult Page, 'That each of his Arguments *separably* is sufficient to warrant the Change he has made; and as to this argument particularly, He saies p. 185. That it might serve instead of all these He hath urged. I affirm the Contrary; and that, even supposing its *Truth*, it cou'd not justify a Separation, abstracting from the Rest. The *Truth* or *Being* of a Church is never to be measured by the Manners of the Members, which may be Good and Bad at different Times, and vary as Men do. The Church of *Israel* was always, as God had fram'd it, a true Church. But if *Holiness of Life* had been made a Note of it, it might in some Junctures have been called no Church at all. When our Saviour visited the World, He cou'd scarce find any

Probity.

Probity in it ; and the formal Religion of the *Pharisees* had made void real and solid Piety. The Blood of all the *Prophets* was lying upon them, and through their own Traditions they had made void the Commandments of God. And yet, notwithstanding all this, Christ did not separate from them. Consequently the like Objection cannot be a justifiable Ground of Separation in any other. Thus Dr *Tenison* now Primate of all *England*, and who is at once the Honour as well as Head of his Order, Reason'd (e) against the *Romanists* urging (with the same Modesty as Mr *Rhind* does) *Holiness of Life* as a Note of their Church. And I suppose the Reasoning will still hold Good. It was then a very Unchristian Act in Mr *Rhind* to separate from the *Presbyterians*, when his shining Virtue and bright Example cou'd not have fail'd to have reclaim'd 'em, or at least to render 'em inexcusable. But it is not the first sad Loss they have sustained, and overcome too ; as, I hope, they shall do this.

However, supposing the *Weight*, let us consider the *Truth* of his Argument. This I shall do by examining the Particulars he insists on. Having spent *Two* or *Three* Pages in describing the *Spirit of the Gospel*, and what he means by the *Spirit of a Party*: He alledges I. That the *Presbyterian Spirit* is *Enthusiastical*. II. That it is a meer *Animal* or *Mechanical Spirit*. III. That it is a *Partial Spirit*, damning and denying Grace to all but their own Party. IV. That it is a *narrow* and *mean Spirit*. V. That it is a *malicious, unforgiving Spirit*. VI. That it is an *unconversible Spirit*. VII. That it is a *Disloyal, Rebellious Spirit*. VIII. That it is a *Spirit of Division*. IX. That it is an *Unneighbourly, Cruel and Barbarous Spirit*.

Here is a very formidable Muster ; yet, after all, not very dangerous. For, Mr *Rhind* has been so well natured as not to cite so much as one *Line* out of any *Presbyterian* Author for proving any Thing of all this ; Tho' that was, I'm sure the *most*, perhaps the *only* habile Way of doing his Business effectually. Nay, tho' the greatest Part of his Charge turns upon *Matter of Fact* ; yet he has not cited so much as one *Historian*, great or small, of either Side, for making it good. But such is the *Episcopal* Way of writing, and we must not complain. *Harangue*

vanque and *Declamation* are All-Powerfull Engines when play'd by a *Canonical* Hand: And when *They* are at so much Pains to labour Their Periods into a *Cadence*, 'tis Rudness and Ill Manners in us to ask for *Proof*, the insisting on which wou'd spoil the Harmony of their Rhetorick. However, we must crave Leave to enquire a little into the Particulars of this Charge.

I. He charges the *Presbyterians* with an *Enthusiastical* Spirit. But on what Grounds? ' 1st, saith he p. 200, Their most ' admired Practical Systems contain Nothing but the ' very Dreg of *Mysticism*, and a *Jargon* no less unintel- ' ligible, than that of *Jacob Behmen* or *Molino*. Well what are these *Practical Systems*? He is so far from citing any Thing out of 'em, that he does not so much as name any of 'em, except the *Two* already mention'd viz. *Shepherd & Guthrie*. For Vindication of Mr *Guthrie's* Book, I ask no more of any Person, but that he'll peruse it seriously; and if, after he has done, he can say there is any other *Mysticism* or *Enthusiasm* in it, than what the Gospel teaches; Nay, than what every Man who is concern'd about his Soul feels, I'll frankly forgive him.

Plainly, the Import of that System is this. That the great Work every Man has to do in this World is to secure Eternal Happiness to Himself. That there are indeed some Persons blessed with the Advantage of a Religious Education; and the Grace of God falling in therewith; They are insensibly train'd up to Piety and Virtue, and find Themselves in a fix'd Habit thereof, without being able to give a distinct Account how it began, or by what sensible Steps it has arriv'd at such a Height. But then the far greater Part of Baptized Persons spend a great Part of their Life either in a Course of *Vice* and *Leudness*, or at best in *Indifferency* and *Carelessness* about their Eternal Salvation. God, who is an Infinite Lover of Souls, and wills not that they shou'd perish; is graciously pleas'd, in His own good Time, by His Spirit, working by these Ways He has appointed, to awaken them into a thoughtful Temper, and to alarm them of their Danger. He engages them seriously to compare their Heart and Life with the Law of God. And, upon the doing this, they cannot but discover a vast Contrariety and Contradiction between them. He engages them

likewise seriously to lay to Heart the *Threatnings* of God, and the dreadfull Things His Law has awarded against such Criminals as they are: And this cannot but affect them with the most *horrible Apprehensions*. For, who can be easie either in Body or Mind under the *Thoughts* of having God for his Enemy; and under the *prospect* of getting Hell for his Portion? God is pleased to *exercise* them with such Thoughts, till he sees they are duly humbled, and in Earnest convinced that it was a *bitter and evil Thing to depart from the Living God*. But then, God does not project for the Uneasiness of His Creatures; nor require Sorrow for Sorrow's Sake, but that they may be the more watchfull against Sin in Time coming, and the more affected with His Goodness in providing a Method of Delivery for them. And therefore, when He has *Exercised* them so long and to such a Height as is needfull for attaining these Ends upon them; He is pleased to begin their Relief by intimating to them, by means of the Gospel, a *Possibility* of Salvation through Jesus Christ. Yet even this is not sufficient to *determine* the Soul to God. For, be the Remedy never so sovereign, yet it can do no good to such as don't apply it; whether through *Despair*, that it will not be effectual; or through a *false Hope* that the Wound will not prove deadly. And therefore, yet further, God, by the Internal Operation of His Spirit, in the Way of Gospel Means, gives a new Turn and Byass to the Soul, not only perswades it that it is *possible* to be saved; and that it is absolutely *needfull* to fall in with the Gospel Method of Salvation; but effectually *determines* it to do so; so that the Soul *heartily* renounces *all Sin*, sincerely engages in a Course of *Universal Holiness*; and, in that Method, trusts to the Merit and Righteousness of Christ *allegorically* for Acceptance with God, Pardon of Sin, and coming to Heaven at last. Now, when a Person finds his Case altered thus so much to the better; is it possible but that he must needs *rejoice with Joy unspeakable and full of Glory*? While he goes on in the Way of Holiness, is it possible but he must find that *the Ways of Wisdom are Ways of Pleasantness, and Her Paths Peace*? When he is sensible that his Eternal Happiness is secured by an Interest in Christ, is it possible but that he must *rejoice in the Hope of the Glory of God*? If at any Time he slack his Diligence, and fall into Sin, through the Infirmary of Nature or the Violence of Satan's

tan's Tentations, and thereupon the *Consolations of the Holy Ghost* are withdrawn, has he not the greatest Reason to be dejected both in Body and Mind, and to pray with the *Psalmist* Ps. LI. 8. 11. *Make me to hear Joy and Gladness: That the Bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice. Cast me not away from thy Presence: Take not Thy Holy Spirit from Me.* Or, if God, even in a *Sovereign Way* overcast His Soul; that he may long so much the more for the uninterrupted joys of Heaven; Is this any other than what the most Holy Men recorded in Scripture have felt?

This is the Import of Mr *Guthrie's* Book, and indeed of all the other *Practical Systems* written by the *Presbyterians* on the same Subject. Is there any thing of *Enthusiasm* in all this? Any irregular Heats? Why then wou'd Mr *Rhind* adventure to expose the *internal Part* of Religion in so ludicrous a Manner as he has done? Certainly, if ever any Man was guilty of the Sin of *doing Despite unto the Spirit of Grace*, he is so. This, which I have told, is that which he calls the *Long and senseless Story of the Manner of Gods dealing with the Souls of his Elect.* These the *strange Things* they talk of their *Manifestations and Descriptions.* This the *sudden and irresistible* Manner of God's influencing them by his Spirit, which Mr *Rhind* thinks so much a *Jest*; but which no Man that fears God will allow himself to think the same Way of. 'Tis true, the *determining* Turn that the Spirit of God gives to the Soul is acknowledged by the *Presbyterians* to be *Instantaneous*; but then They acknowledge too a great Deal of *Preparatory Work*, and Mr *Guthrie*, in particular largely insists on it: So that Mr *Rhind's* representing the *Presbyterians* p. 193. as pleading for Conversions; attended with such Circumstances as these of *Paul* &c were, is only an Instance of that *Calumny* to which he has so intirely given up himself.

2dly, Another Ground, whereon Mr *Rhind* wou'd found the Charge of *Enthusiasm* against the *Presbyterians*, is, That they pretend, as he alleges p. 190, to *Illuminations and Raptures* and to the most extraordinary *Inspirations*; and then he falls a disputing very wightly in order to disprove their being *extraordinarily* inspired, and very frequently compares them to the *Modern Prophets* in their *Agitations*. But how does he prove that They pretend to any such Thing? No Way. He has not so much as offered at doing so, nor adduced one Syllable for that Purpose. What then is to be thought of

of him and his Fellow-Writers who ordinarily talk at the same Rate? Is it not plain that they are under the Power of *Hypochondriacal Melancholy*, whereof wild and extravagant Imaginations, for which there is no Ground, are a most Infallible Symptom?

But why did Mr Rhind charge the *Presbyterians* with *Enthusiasm*, when his own Beloved Party had been so scandalously Guilty of it? In the *First* place, when *Enthusiasm* was in Fashion in the Time of the late Civil Wars, who were the great Masters of it? The *Presbyterians* in Scotland preach'd and wrote against it; but the *Episcopalians* in England cherished it; and some of their Clergy were the principal Writers for it, for Instance, Mr William Erbery who owns Himself to have been *Episcopally* ordain'd. There is a thick *Quarto* Volume of his Lucubrations extant under the Title of his *Testimony*, from which 'tis evident that Jacob Behmen might have gone to School to him to learn *Enthusiasm*. 2dly, Does not Parker who writes against the *Confession of Faith*, and has prefixed to it a Poem against the Synod of Dort and in praise of *Arminius*, and who was just such another Protestant as Mr Rhind, does not he, I say, avow Himself an *Enthusiast*, and recommend Jacob Behmen and such others as divinely inspired (f)? 3dly, Who knows not that Dr George Garden, one of the first Character among the *Episcopal* Clergy, is the great promoter of the *Bourignian* Principles? 4thly, Who were they that were mostly carried away by the *Modern Prophets* and seized with their *Agitations*? I suppose the *Episcopal* Clergy cannot purge their own Families. 5thly, Does not the Author of Mr Dodwell's Life confess that, toward the latter Part of it, He seemed to grow not a little *Enthusiastical*? And is it possible any one can read his *Epistolary Discourse* and not be convinced of this. For Instance, when he teaches that our Saviour preached to the *Separate Souls* who deceased before His Incarnation, Sect. 41. When he teaches that *Water Baptism* was given to the *separate Souls* of them who had no Means of obtaining it when living Sect. 42. When he teaches that *Renunciation of the Devil* was performable in the *separate state* by those who cou'd not know their Duty before Sect. 43. When he teaches that the *Gentiles* received the Spirit by our Saviour's Baptism in
their

their separate state Sect. 44. When he reaches that *the Apostles being themselves deceased preached to the deceased Gentiles.* Sect. 45. Were there ever more distracted Notions than these vented in *Bedlam*? I think then it were the Wisdom of the *Episcopal Party* for their own sakes to drop the Charge of *Enthusiasm* against the *Presbyterians*. I shall conclude this with observing by the By, That Mr *Rhind* writes inaccurately when he Yoaks *Jacob Behmen* and *Molinos* together. *Molinos's* greatest Errors, for which He seems to have been so severely persecuted by the Church of *Rome*, were according to the best information the Doctrines of *Predestination* and its Dependencies, and his teaching People to place their Devotion rather in internal Prayer and Communion with God than in numbering their Beads (g): Whereas all the *Enthusiasts*, are mortal Enemies to the Doctrines of *Predestination* &c, and Mr *Poivet* owns that he levelled his *Oeconomie Divin* mainly against these Doctrines. And Dr *Garden* does the same in his Writings. So much for the Charge of an *Enthusiastical Spirit*.

II. He Charges the *Presbyterians* with a meerly *Animal* or *Mechanical* Spirit, and that all their Hopes and Fears, Joys and Sorrows in Religion are meer *Mechanism*, the Effect of *Melancholy*, *Imagination* and *Animal Impressions*. Hear him a little p. 196. 'He (that is, a *Presbyterian* after the Commission of some grievous sin) dreams of Nothing but of Hell and Damnation, which in the Hurry of his passions perhaps forces him to dispatch Himself. But if the black Blood shall chance to be sweetened by a Mixture of better, and if the Violence of His Passions is abated, He begins to conceive better hopes. And if He shall chance to recover from this Fever, so that his Blood does again glide after its due Manner, he concludes that all is well with him. Thus he and a great deal more to the same purpose.' 'Tis true, the *Presbyterians* own themselves to be compound Beings, and that they consist of *Flsh* as well as *Spirit*, and believe that God applys

applies Himself to them according to the Make of Human Nature, and discovers Infinite Wisdom and Goodness in doing so; for *He knows our Frame and remembers we are Dust*. But, because the *Animal Affections* operate Sensibly, either upon the Commission of some grievous Sin, or upon our having made Peace with God, does it therefore follow that the *Spirit* of God did not excite them? Or that, because the *inferior* and bodily Faculties do operate, therefore the *Superior* Faculties do not? Is it possible but that the Soul and Body must work mutually upon and affect each other while we are in the *embodied State*? Nay, will they not do so even after the Resurrection which is the most *perfect State*? Does He not know that a *Separate State* is a preternatural one which Sin alone has made us liable unto. The truth is, I think Mr Rhind, alter all his Boasts, to be but very indifferently qualified to write Lectures upon the *Animal OEconomy*, and that he is a perfect Stranger to *Solon's* Precept *Nosce Teipsum*, as well as to the *Exercise* of piety. And therefore, ere he begin to write his Lectures, I cannot but recommend to him the perusal of that excellent Discourse concerning the *Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* annexed to that very pious Book called *A Tale of a Tub*. If Mr Rhind can recover the papers necessary for the filling up the *Lacuna* p. 303. his Business is done: For the Bookseller has assured us, that *In them the whole Scheme of Spiritual Mechanism was deduced and explained, with an Appearance of great reading and observation; tho' it was thought neither safe nor convenient to print them*. Such devout Books tend mightily to the promoting of Religion, and many such the Church of England Clergy has blessed this sinfull Age with: And it cannot but raise Mr Rhind's Character to Communicate such laudable Productions of his Brethren for the Benefit of the Publick. But to go on

If Mr Rhind was so great an Enemy to every thing of *Animal Exercise* in Religion, Why did He join the Church of England: For, of all other Protestant Churches in the World, She has aimed most at the raising the *Animal Affections* by her Way of Worship, though she is so unhappy as to attempt it by Methods which our Blessed Saviour never instituted: For what else means the Pom-
pousness

pousness of her *Service*? What else is designed by the *Cope*, *Surplice*, *Rotchet* &c? What else by the *Ceremonies* and all that Mimical Cringing and Bowing (so much practised in the Chapel and Cathedral Worship) which is below the Gravity of a Man much more of a Minister? Can there be any thing else designed by all this, but to bear upon the Senses and affect the Imagination? What is the *Surplice* and all the other Sacred Accoutrements intended for, but to dazzle the *Eyes*? What are the *Organs* and *singing Boys* designed for, but to charm the *Ears*? Why are the Prayers and the whole Devotions parcell'd into such Shreds, but that the *Animal Part* may be gratified with Variety? Mr. *Rhind* then ought to have been aware of touching upon this Point: For, after all the Abstraction he and his Party pretend to, the World sees well enough that they are but Flesh and Blood like their Neighbours.

III. He charges the *Presbyterians* with a *partial* Spirit, damning and denying Grace to all but their own Party. ' So few, *saith he* p. 191 are they to whom they allow this Not a *Partial*,
' saving Grace, that, if we shall except the Apostles, *tial*, *Damn-*
' and those of that extraordinary Age, and St *Augustin*, *ing* Spirit.
' They'll allow none to have been blessed with it, till
' it was vouchsafed to some *Presbyterians* in the West of *Scotland*, about
' a hundred Years ago, who convey'd it to their Successors, and
' infected some of their *English* Brethren therewith. And p. 204.
They confine, *saith he*, *the Grace of Conversion, and consequently Election*
to their own Party. This is indeed a hainous Charge. But how has
he proved it? Nay not so much as the *least* Document has he offered
to produce for that Purpose. The *Episcopal* Veracity must stand for
all. But the *Presbyterians* deny the Charge till They shall see it
proved.

In the mean Time I charge Mr *Rhind* and his Party with a *Partial*,
Damning Spirit, and shall prove it ere I go further. *First* I charge
Mr *Rhind* with it. For, speaking of the Spirit of the *Presbyterians*
p. 216. He expressly says that *it drives them from the Communion of the*
Church, and cuts them off from the ordinary Communications of the Holy
Ghost. Besides, he has (as we have heard before) damned the whole
Protestant Churches that want *Episcopal* Government. Nay, he has

damned the whole *Catholick Church* of Christ by declaring her Doctrines *fundamentally false and pernicious*. Secondly, I charge his Party with it. Besides many Shoals of lesser Authors, I instance, for the Purpose Mr *Dodwell* the Standard-Bearer of the Party. In his Book of *Schism*, the Sum of the XV Chapter is, That the Spirit of God is not given, nor his Graces communicated, nor Pardon of Sin bestow'd, nor Salvation to be expected without the Sacraments. The Design of his XVIII Chapter is to prove, That the Validity of the Sacraments depends on the Authority of the Persons by whom they are administred. The Design of his XIX Chapter is to prove, That no other Ministers have this Authority of administring the Sacraments but *only* they who receive their Orders in the *Episcopal* Communion. The Sum of all is, No Bishop no Minister; No Minister No Sacrament; No Sacrament no Salvation; Ergo no Bishop no Salvation. Or take it in his own Words (b) 'The alone Want of Communion with the Bishop makes Persons *Aliens from God and Christ, Strangers to the Covenant of Promise and the Common Wealth of Israel*....' 'They must certainly be deprived of all those real Enjoyments and Holy Relishes which devout Souls experience even in this Life in the Communion with their best Beloved. In a Word, he tells us, that on *that* Account we must want the *Comforts* of Religion here, and lose the *Hopes* of enjoying them hereafter. Say now, good Reader, if it is not modest in the *Episcopal* Party to charge the *Presbyterians* with a *Damning* Spirit. Whether Atheism, Laziness or Uxoriousness (as Mr *Rhind* alledges against the *Presbyterians*) can engage Men of Sense to entertain such *Phantastick* Principles, I shall not say: But sure I am, they come not from the Spirit of God, nor are consistent with the Peace of the Church or Nation.

IV. He charges the *Presbyterians* with a *Narrow and Mean Spirit*. Upon what Evidence? 1st, 'Christ, Not a *Narrow* or *Mean* Spirit. 'saith He, dyed for all Men, but the *Presbyterians* confine the Merit of His Death to a *Predestinated Few* p. 207. I answer, The *Presbyterians* acknowledg that Christ died for *all* Men in *all* that

that Sense the Scripture meant ever that Expression. 'Tis true They confine the Efficacy of his Death to the *Predestinated*, and acknowledg that Christ's *Flock* (comparatively speaking) is but a *little* one; but 'tis false that they confine it to a *Few*: On the contrary, they believe the Redeemed to be past numbring, and hope, upon the Assurance of the Scripture, Rev. VII. 9. to behold one Day a great *Multitude which no Man can number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues standing before the Throne, and before the Lamb, cloathed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands, and Hymns in their Mouths.* 2dly, 'Christ meant, saith he, that his Grace should extend *universally*, which the Presbyterians restrain to their own Party. I answer. The first Part of this Charge is false Doctrine, the latter impudent Calumny. The first Part of it I say is *false Doctrine*, for which (waving other Arguments at this Time) I appeal to the Church of England, which, in her *Catechism*, tho' she teaches her *Catechumens* to say, *I believe in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all Mankind*, yet she expressly restricts the Object of sanctifying Grace; and teaches the *Catechumen* to say, *I believe in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth Me and all the Elect People of God.* The latter Part of the Charge, I add, is *impudent Calumny*. The Presbyterians are so far from restraining Grace to their own Party, that they both believe and profess that *in every Nation he that feareth God and worketh Righteousness is accepted of him.*

But then, who knows not that *High-Church* is guilty of this *Narrowness* and Meanness of Spirit even to the last Degree of Scandal? Is it not known that They not only deny Grace to Presbyterians, but even confine the Church of England to their own Party, and reckon all such, even of the *Episcopal* Communion, *Schismatics*, as fall in with the Government; nay, in their most solemn Offices, rank their Episcopal Brethren of the lower Form in the very same Class with *Pagans*. Thus, in their new Liturgy (i) which they formed after K. William's Accession to the Throne, They prayed in Terms, *Restore to us again the Publick Worship of thy Name, the re-*

Q q

verent

[1] See a Pamphlet entituled *Reflections upon a Form of Prayer lately set forth for the Jacobites of the Church of England*, printed for Richard Balgwin. 1690.

verent Administration of thy Sacraments: Raise up the former Government both in Church and State, that We may be no longer without King, without Priest, without God in the World. 3dly, 'Christ's Charity,' saith he, relieved all Men indifferently, Enemies as well as freinds 'while the Presbyterian Byass visibly sways them to favour the 'Godly, that is, those of their own Way. 'Tis answered, The Presbyterians, as they have Opportunity, do good unto all Men; tho' indeed, according to the Apostles Precept, *especially unto them who are of the Household of Faith*, whether of their own or any other Way; tho' no doubt, they love those of their own Way best; and I suppose all the World does the like.

In the mean while, tho' 'tis both Vain and sinfull to *boast* on this Head, yet for stopping the Mouth of Calumny, the Presbyterians are content it be put to a Trial, which of the Parties have gone furthest in their Publick Deeds of Charity to the other in their Distress. By all the Information I can have, the *Episcopal* Clergy, during the whole 28 Years of their late Reign, never relieved any of their *Presbyterian* Brethren with so much as one shilling. The Truth is, they durst not ask it, but thought themselves happy enough, if they escaped without being relieved out of all their Miseries at once by the COMPENDIOUS Way then in Fashion: Whereas, to my certain Knowledg, the *Presbyterians* have often relieved the *Episcopalians*, and I hope shall always continue to do so in Imitation of their Heavenly Father who *is kind even to the Bad and the Unthankfull*; and in spite of the *Apocryphal* Prohibition *Eccclus. XII. 5. Give not to the Ungodly: Hold back thy bread and give it not unto him.*

V. He charges Them with a *Malicious* and *Unforgiving Spirit* p. 209. so contrary to that which Our Saviour and the Blessed Martyr St Stephen exemplified. Well how does He qualifie or prove this Charge? Why, 'their *Rebellious Martyrs*, saith he, never expressed their Forgivness of the Injuries, 'which They thought were done them by their supposed Persecutors: 'Their *last Speeches* so faithfully recorded in *Naphthali*, and so much admired by the party, containing rather too plain Indications of the Malice

‘ Malice and Rancour of their Souls, when they were stepping into Eternity. Thus he. ’Tis true, these *rebellious Martyrs* did not allow themselves to die as a Fool dieth, tho, their Hands were bound and their Feet (and Legs too) were oftimes put into the most pinching Fetters. They boldly avowed the Cause for which they died, and with all Freedom told their Persecuters of their Injustice and the wicked Course they were in. And for this Practice they had the Example of the Blessed Martyr Stephen, who treated the Sanhedrim with sharper Language than any is to be found in *Naphtali*. *Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in Heart and Ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: As your Fathers did so do ye. Which of the Prophets have not your Fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which shewed before of the Coming of the Just One, of whom ye have been now the Betrayers and Murderers.* Acts VII. 51. 52.

But now as to the Charge it self. If we shall find these *rebellious Martyrs* expressing their *Forgiveness* of their Enemies: If we shall find them doing this in their *last Speeches*: If we shall find them doing this in their last Speeches recorded in *Naphtali*; will not this discover what a Spirit of Truth and Modesty that is, the *Episcopal Party* are possessed with? Let us try it then.

The Marquess of *Argile* who suffered May 27. 1661. ‘ And, *saith He*, as I go to make a Reckoning to my God, I am free as to any of these Calumnies that have gone abroad of me, concerning the King’s Person or Government. I was *real* and cordial in my *Desires* to bring the King Home, and in my *Endeavours* for Him when He was at Home, and I had *no* Correspondence with the Adversary’s Army, nor any of them, in the Time when His Majesty was in *Scotland*; nor had I any Accession to His late Majesties horrid and execrable Murder, by Counsel or Knowledge of it, or any other Manner of Way. This is a Truth, as I shall answer to my Judge---- I desire not that the Lord should judge any Man; nor do I judge any but my Self: I wish, as the Lord hath pardoned me, so He may pardon them for this and other Things, and that what they have done to me, may never meet them in their Accounts.-----And I pray the Lord preserve His Majesty and to pour out His best Blessings on His Person and Government. *Naph. Edit.* 1693. p. 285. &c.

Mr *James Guthrie* Minister of the Gospel at *Sterlin* who suffered *June 1. 1661.* ‘God is my Record, *saieth he*, that in these things for which sentence of Death hath passed against me, I have a good Conscience. I bless God they are not Matters of Compliance with Sectaries, or Designs or Practices against His Majesty’s Person or Government of his Royal Father: My Heart (I bless God) is conscious unto *no* Disloyalty; nay, *Loyal* I have been, and I commend it unto you to be *Loyal* and Obedient in the Lord. ----- The Mistake or Hatred or Reproach of my Enemies I do with all my Heart *forgive*, and wherein I have offended any of them do beg their Mercy and Forgiveness ----- I *forgive* all Men the Guilt of my death, and I desire you to do so also: *Pray for them that persecute you, and bless them that curse you, bless I say and curse not.* *Ibid.* p. 291. &c.

The Lord *Wariston* who suffered *July 22 1663.* ‘The good Lord give unto them (*His Enemies*) Repentance, Remission and Amendement; and that is the worst wish I wish them, and the best wish I can wish unto them. ----- I am free (as I shall now answer before His Tribunal) from *any* Accession by Counsel or Contrivance, or *any* other Way to his late Majesty’s Death, or to their making that Change of Government: And I Pray the Lord to preserve our present King His Majesty, and to pour out his best Blessings upon His Royal Posterity. *Ibid.* p. 301. &c.

Captain *Andrew Arnot* who suffered *December 7. 1666.* ‘And whoever they be that any Way have been Instrumental or incensed against me to procure this Sentence against me, God *forgive* them and I *forgive* them. *Ibid.* p. 316. And in his *joint Testimony* which he, with *Nine* others who were put to Death the same Day with him, subscribed in Prison immediately before they were brought to the Scaffold, he and they in Terms acknowledg the King’s Authority. ‘We are, *say they*, condemned by Men, and esteemed by many as Rebels against the King, *whose Authority we acknowledge*: ‘But this is our rejoicing the Testimony of our Conscience. *Ibid.* p. 307. &c.

Mr. *Alexander Robertson* Preacher of the Gospel, who suffered *December 14. 1666.* ‘I wish that they may lay the Matter to Heart and repent of it, that God may *forgive* them, as I *forgive* all Men; and

‘ and particularly *Morton* who did apprehend me,--- And he is so far from entertaining rebellious Thoughts that he declares *There was just Reason to think, that if these rigid Oppressions had been made known to his Majesty, his Justice and Clemency wou’d have provided a Remedy. Ibid. p. 320. &c.*

Mr *Hugh M’kaile* Preacher of the Gospel who suffered *December 22. 1666.* ‘ I do freely pardon all that have Accession to my Blood, ‘ and wish that it be not laid to the Charge of this sinful Land, but ‘ that God wou’d grant Repentance to our *Rulers*, that they may obtain the same Reconciliation with Him, whereof I my self do partake. *Ibid. p. 330 &c.*

John Wilson who suffered at the same Time with Mr *M’kaile.* ‘ For my Part I pray that the Lord may bless our *King* with Blessings from ‘ Heaven,--- And I pray for *all* that are in Authority under his *Majesty*--- I can forgive the Wrong done to me in taking away my Life ‘ for this Cause, and wish God to be mercifull to those that have condemned me, or have had any Hand in my Death. *Ibid. p. 351. &c.*

Mr. *James Mitchel* while under the Torture of the Boots *Anno 1676.* ‘ And now my Lords, I do freely from my Heart forgive you who ‘ are Judges sitting upon the Bench, and the Men who are appointed ‘ to be about this Piece of horrid Work, & also these who are vitiating ‘ their Eyes beholding the same. And I do intreat, that God may never ‘ lay it to the Charge of any of you, as I beg God may be pleased ‘ for his Son Christ’s sake to blot out my Sins and Iniquities. *Ibid. p. 431.*

James Learmont who suffered *September 27. 1678.* ‘ As for *Alexander Maitland* who apprehended me, my Blood lyes directly at his ‘ Door, who promised me then, that nothing should reach my Life, ‘ as he swore by Faith and Conscience, and his Brother is also ‘ guilty of my Blood. I desire the Lord to give them Repentance and ‘ Mercy if it be possible. *Ibid. p. 445.* And in his *Large Speech p. 450.* He thus delivers himself. ‘ I here most freely, before I go hence (without Desire of Revenge upon the forenamed Persons, or any other, ‘ who have been the Occasion of my Blood shedding, now in my last ‘ Words after the Example of my Lord and Master) say as is mentioned in that Scripture *Luke 23. 34.* And *Jesus said, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.* My dear Friends, I give my ‘ Testimony against that Calumny cast upon *Presbyterians*, that they are
Se-

‘ Seditious and *Disloyal* Persons, the which Asperſion I do abhorr.
 ‘ Therefore, I exhort all People, that they will ſhew *Loyalty* to
 ‘ the *King*, and all lawfull Magiſtrats, and all their juſt and law-
 ‘ full Commands.

Mr. *John King* Miniſter of the Goſpel who ſuffered *Auguſt* 14.
 1679. ‘ The Lord knows, who is the Searcher of Hearts, that
 ‘ neither my Deſign nor Practice was againſt His Maſteſty’s Perſon
 ‘ and juſt Government, but I always intended to be *loyal* to lawfull
 ‘ Authority in the Lord. I thank God, my heart doth not condemn
 ‘ me of any *Diſloyalty*, I have been *loyal*, and do recommend it to
 ‘ all to be Obedient to Higher Powers in the Lord. I bleſs the
 ‘ Lord, I can freely and frankly *forgive* all Men the Guilt of it, even
 ‘ as I deſire to be forgiven of God. *Pray for them that Perſecute*
 ‘ *You and Bleſs them that Curſe You.* *Ibid.* p. 469. 475.

John Nilſon of *Corſack* who ſuffered *December* 14. 1666. ‘ I
 ‘ pray that the Lord for Chriſt’s Sake may freely forgive me, as I
 ‘ have *forgiven* them that have wronged me. *Ibid.* p. 327.

Theſe are the *Rebellious Martyrs* recorded in *Naphtali* who *never*
 expreſſed the Forgivneſs of the Injuries they thought were done
 them. *Rebellious Martyrs* they were; for, when ſtepping into E-
 ternity, they not only denied and diſowned any Act of Rebellion:
 But ſpent their laſt Breath in praying for the *King* and in recom-
 mending *Loyalty* to their Survivors. Theſe *laſt Words* of theirs
 which I have cited are no doubt as good Evidence of the *Presby-*
terian Malice, as their Sufferings are of the *Episcopal Mercy*. I can-
 not but wiſh that the *Episcopal* Authors wou’d retain, at leaſt,
 ſome *Relique* of Modeſty and not advance Things, not only *without*
 all Ground, but *contrary* alſo to the cleareſt and ampleſt Teſtimony.
 I’m ſure they cannot but be ſenſible how odious ſuch a Way of
 Writing muſt needs make any Party that uſes it to God and all
 good Men.

They very frequently inſiſt on this Topick of *Forgiving Enemies*
 againſt the *Presbyterians*; but ’tis in ſuch a Way as ſufficiently diſco-
 vers their Meaning. I remember betwixt the Year 1680 & 1688. there
 was no Doctrine more frequently inſiſted on from the Pulpits of
Edinburgh than that of *Forgiving Enemies*. In the mean Time, the
Gibbet,

Gibbet, to save Expences, was left standing in the open Street from one Mercat Day to another for hanging the *Whigs*. People were mightily puzzled for a while to reconcile the Episcopal Preaching and Practice together. At last the secret was found out; that the Meaning was, that *their* Enemies should forgive *them*; But then, that *they* shou'd forgive *their* Enemies was a different Case. They must then take the Sponge to their late Books in which they have so often libelled the *Presbyterians* on this Head, and wait till the Memory of the late Times is worn out, ere they can persuade People that *their* insisting on the *Forgiveness of Enemies* is any other than most odious Affectation; just as when the *Inquisition* turns over a poor Wretch to the Secular Arm, intreating in the Bowels of Jesus Christ to be tender to Him; the Meaning of which is, that *Secular Arm* must burn the Poor Creature Quick, on Pain of Excommunication and a worse Turn besides. And is there any other Proof needfull to shew what a Jest the *Episcopal* insisting on *Forgiveness of Enemies* is, than to read over Mr. *Ruina's* Book, especially the latter Part of it, which breaths pure unmixed Malice for *Thirty Pages* together, and that too which makes it so much the more Ridiculous, without the least Shadow of Truth or proof. If a Man treat me harshly, however bitter the Things may be He saies against me, yet if they are true, and He convinces me that they are so, I ought to bear with Him, and 'tis my own Fault if I don't profit by the Reproof. But if he charges me with the worst Things, without so much as offering to convince me, I condemn the Malice of the poor Impotent Thing, and cannot revenge My Self better than by suffering Him to fry in His own Grease, and prey upon his own Spleen.

VI He charges the *Presbyterians* p. 209. with an *Unconversibile Spirit*, in that *they value themselves upon the Sullenness of their Tempers*. A very great Fault truly. For certainly Christianity is superstrusted upon Humanity, and the Grace of God was intended not to destroy, but to improve and refine it. And the Apostle has exprestly commanded us 1 Pet. III 8 *Love as Brethren, be pitifull, be Courteous*: Nor does Piety ever appear more charming and engaging than when *Altogether*

Not an *Unconversibile Spirit*.

a good Behaviour. But how does Mr. *Rhind* prove his Charge? Why, Good Reader, He does not so much as *attempt* this, nor has offered so much as one Syllable for that Purpose. Is it not then as easily denied as affirmed. And is not the Defender, in all such odious Cases, presumed to be Innocent till the Contrary is proved. 'Tis true Our Saviour's Desire (as Mr. *Rhind* suggests) of doing Good carried Him into the Company of the Men of *loose*, as well as regular Lives, and I believe all Presbyterians, whether Ministers or others, who are piously inclin'd, are carried, by the same Desire of doing Good, into the Company of Men of loose Lives, when there is the least Hope that their doing so will not rather *harden* them *in*, than *reclaim* them *from* their Looseness. But then, That they keep at a Distance from them in their Revells, study a Preciseness of Conversation, and *will not run with them to the same Excess of Riot*, however *strangely* they may be thought of on that Account; This they are so far from reckoning a Fault, that they avow it, and are sorry there is not more Ground for charging them with it. Mr. *Rhind* may call 'em *Puritans* on that Score, or give 'em what other ill Names He pleases: But then, what comforts them is, that the Apostle *Paul* was just such another *Puritan*; and not only warrants them *in*, but obliges them to such Preciseness and Abstraction, commanding them I. Cor. V. 11. *With such Persons not so much as to eat*. And II. Theff. III. 14. *To note such Persons, and have no Company with them*. Our Blessed Saviour was such a Physician as was not in Danger of catching the Disease from the Patient. But when virtuous Persons allow themselves to haunt bad Company in their Bottle Conversation, I'm afraid it too often falls out, that they themselves are infected, and the vicious not reformed.

However, whatever *Unconversibleness* the Presbyterians may be guilty of, I suppose Mr. *Rhind* might have kept at Home, and reserved His Lecture for *High-Church*: Not that they are very nice in their *Practice*; for, I believe, the best that can be said of 'em as to that is, That they are (if I may use our Country Phrase) but like Neighbour and other. But, if the Church of *England* Divines themselves may be believed, Mr. *Bisset* for Instance; The Height of their *Principle* makes them so much Enemies to the Rest of Mankind, that neither Presbyterians nor even *Low-Church* can walk the Streets

Streets in Safty, but are every Moment in Danger of being juffed into the Kennel by *High-Church*.

Tantum Relligio potuit suadere Malorum!

But it is not this or that Man's particular Testimony we need depend on. 'Tis plain their Principles oblige them to such Hostility against the rest of Mankind: For, were I of Mr *Rhind's* Faith, and believed all the same ill Things of the *Presbyterians* that he does, I wou'd not only reckon it *unlawfull* to converse with them, but I shou'd think my self obliged in Conscience to destroy them. If they are Schismatics, Hereticks, and their Spirit diametrically opposite to that of the Gospel, &c. What shou'd Men do, but treat them as mad Dogs, knock 'em on the Head, and rid the World of such Nuisances.

VII. He charges them with a *Disloyal, Rebellious Spirit*. p. 210. I hope, every Man ought not to be believed a Rebel who has been at any Time called one. I have observed before p. 29. that Mr *Dodwell* was proclaimed a Rebel by K. *James*, yet who, for all that, believes he was such? Perhaps the *Presbyterians* will be found as Innocent.

Mr *Rhind* founds his Charge both upon their Principles and Practices.

First, upon their Principles. But, had he thought that any part of his Business, I suppose he wou'd have found the Proof of this a very hard Task. The Principles of a Church are to be gathered from her publick Formula's. And I appeal to every Body who has read the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and the *Thirty nine Articles* of the Church of England, if the first is not as Loyal as the latter. But they are private Authors not publick Confessions that Mr *Rhind* was to build on. And, for his Purpose, he names (for he cites nothing) *Buchanan's Treatise de jure Regni*, *Rutherford's Lex Rex*, *Naphthali* and the *Hind let loose*. Which Books, saith he p. 211, the *Presbyterians* have not to this Day branded with any publick Censure, tho' they have been often upbraided, and solemnly challenged to condemn, otherwise to be counted Abettors of them. The Answer,

I hope, will be pretty easie. The *Presbyterians* love to walk by Example, and to give Place to their Betters. Mr *Rhind* certainly knows that the Bishops and other Clergy of the Church of *England* have publish'd at least a Hundred Books and Pamphlets with the same Principles and Schemes of Government as are in *Buchanan*, *Rutherford* &c. Let the *Convocation* once condemn these, and begin with the Bishop of *Sarum*, Dr *Higden* and Mr *Hoadly*; and then possibly the *General Assembly* may write after their Copy. 'Tis certain the *Presbyterians* maintain no other Principles of Government than what the Church of *England* has practis'd, no other Principles than these upon which She, with the Assistance of her good Neighbours, preserved the Protestant Religion in 1688. I am not for prying into the Power of Princes, remembering to have read somewhere *Periculi plenum est de ijs disputare qui possunt amputare, de ijs scribere qui possunt proscribere*, but I think the Principles of our *Scots* Episcopalians are beyond the Power of all Natural Understanding to account for. *Claudius* and *Nero*, who reigned successively in the Time of writing the New Testament, were both Usurpers and Tyrants, had neither Hereditary nor Parliamentary Right; yet both the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul* enjoyn'd Subjection to them, and commanded Prayers for them. Her present Majesty has both the fullest and clearest Right any Prince possibly can have. She has exercis'd it in the most obliging Manner, particularly with Respect to them. Now that, notwithstanding all this, they shou'd have so long refused to pray for Her, and that most of 'em shou'd do so still; this I affirm is unaccountable in Point both of Duty and Gratitude. Nor have the Actings of *High Church* in *England* been more accountable, as I hope we shall hear afterwards.

Secondly, He charges us with Disloyal Practices. They were no sooner hatched, saith he p. 212. than they rebelled. Sweet Popery! What a charming Thing art Thou; when even Protestants, nay those that will needs be the only Christians among 'em, affirm that a Reformation from Thee was Rebellion? But let us hear his Instances of their Rebellion?

First, He begins, where the Reformation began, viz. at Q. Mary's Reign, ' whose Reputation, saith he, they blackned, whose Authority and Government they resisted and reviled, whose Person

'son they imprisoned, and whom they obliged to fly, in Hope to save that Life which she cruelly lost. Thus He. Every Body must needs own that of all others the *Episcopal* Writers are the nimblest Disputants. When we dispute with them about the Government of the Church in Q. Mary's Days, by no means will they allow that it was *Presbyterian*. No. *Superintendents* were the same Thing with *Bishops* (*k*). Well, be it so: And let us dispute a little about Loyalty in the Government of the State. How came it that under an *Episcopacy*, Q. Mary was so ill treated? Oh, now the Case alters, the whole Government was then in the Hands of the *Presbyterians*. Rebellion was the very Egg out of which they were hatch'd!

Quo teneam Vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

But let us suppose the Presbyterians had then the Government, What did they? Why *first*, saith he, *they blackned Her Reputation*. For Answer, I ask has Archbishop *Spotswood* whitened it? Does not He tell the Story of Signior *Davie* much after the same Way with *Buchanan*? Does He not tell of the horrid abuse the King met with at *Stirling*, how He was neither admitted to be present at the Baptism of His Son, nor suffered to come to the Feast? How the forreign Ambassadors were discharged to see or salute Him, and such of the Nobility as vouchsafed him a Visit were frown'd upon by the Court, and he at last dismissed with a Dose of Poison in his Guts. Does he not expressly tell that the King was Murdered by *Bothwell* and the Queen's Domesticks? Does not all the World know that Her Majesty afterwards married the Murderer, and that too, upon a Divorce from the Lady *Jean Gordon* his wife obtain'd in the most Scandalous Manner? Does not *Spotswood* I say relate all these Things? Was *Spotswood* Presbyterian?

Nor is *Spotswood* alone in the Relation of 'em. For, not to mention other *Scots* or *English* Historians, *Ruggerius Tritonius* Abbot of *Pignerol*, who was a Zealous Papist, a hearty Friend to Q. Mary, lived in the Time, was Secretary to *Vincentius Laureus* Cardinal de Monte Regali, who was sent *Nuncio* from the Pope to the Queen for assisting Her with his Counsel in the Extirpation of He-

R r 2

resy,

refy, and was lying in *Paris* waiting for Orders from the Queen to come over into *Scotland*, at the Time when the King was murdered, and kept an exact Correspondence with the *Roman* Catholicks there: This Author, I say, thus every Way qualified for bearing Witness in this Case, expressly relates * and that with the *Permission of his Superiors*, That when the Nobility told Her Majesty, that they had taken up Arms for bringing *Bothwell* to punishment for Murdering the King &c, Her Majesty justified *Bothwell*, and told them, *He had done Nothing without her Consent*. Did then the Presbyterians Forge any of these things?

But 2dly, saith Mr *Rhind*, they resisted and reviled Her Authority and Government, that is to say, they wou'd not allow Her to restore Popery, nor wou'd they commit the Young Prince to the Custody of *Bothwell* who had murder'd His Father. Were not these very unpardonable Faults?

Yet further 3dly, Q. *Elizabeth* took off her head; and no doubt she, and her Council that advised Her to it, were staunch Presbyterians. So much for Q. *Mary's* Reign:

Secondly, In *K. James VI's* Reign. Mr *Rhind* owns (which is very much from him) that in his Days they did not break out into open Rebellion. Why then, they cannot be so rebelliously disposed as He wou'd represent them: For if they had, it is not quite improbable but they might have made their own Terms of Peace: But, says Mr *Rhind*, they Occasion'd Vexations and Disturbances to Him; that is to say, they protected Him in his Cradle, set the Crown on his head, fought for him, and kept the Country in greater Peace, when he went to fetch home his Queen, than it had been known to be in for many Years before; which he himself acknowledged, and gave publick Thanks to God for. 'Tis true, they grudged the receiving Bishops and the five Articles of *Perth*, which he wou'd needs press upon us in Order to a Conformity with *England*. But I cannot think either *England* or we or the Royal Family cou'd have been much Losers, tho' he had never fallen into that Politick: Before

* Interrogati quanam de causa armati illuc accessissent, non alia, respondisse feruntur, nisi, ut atrocem Injuriam a *Boduellio* factam, ac crudelem & indignam Regis necem, vimque ipsimet Reginae illarum vindicaret. At Regina noxam *Boduelli* purgare: Nihil non ipsa assentiente commissum. See *Vita Vincentij Laurei S. R. E. Cardinalis Montis Regalis. Ruggerio Tritonio Pinaroli Abbate Auctore. Impressa Bononia 4to apud Hæredes Johannis Rosij. CIO IO IC Superiorum Permissu. P. 19---31.*

Before I proceed to the next Reign, I must beg Leave for a short Digression, which, I hope, the Reader will the more easily excuse, that it is not so much from the Subject as from the Author; and is intended to do Justice to the Memory of the Dead, who are not in Capacity to redress themselves. The Matter is this.

The Right Honourable the Earl of *Cromerty*, very lately *quitted* in May last 1713. Publish'd a Book bearing this Title, AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CONSPIRACIES BY THE EARLS OF GOWRIE, AND ROBERT LOGAN OF RESTALRIG, AGAINST K. JAMES VI. Therein (*Preface* p. VIII.) His Lordship writes thus.

'As to Truth in my Present Subject, the Malicious Designers, against the *Royal Family* in *Scotland*, did at first invent, and then foment, a most improbable Falshood, making it their Business to suggest, that *Gowrie* and His Brother did never Conspire against the King; But that the King did Murder them both. This was invented and clandestinely propagated by *Brute, Rollock, Dury, Melvil*, and other *Presbyterian* Ministers. Thus His Lordship.

'Tis hugely afflicting to the *Presbyterians* to find their Forefathers represented, by a Person of His Lordship's Figure, under the Odious Character of MALICIOUS DESIGNERS AGAINST THE ROYAL FAMILY. What is usually advanced against 'em by the Common Herd of *Episcopal* Writers they can securely contemn: For, why shou'd that give them any Concern, which their Enemies Blurt out without any Care? But such a Charge from His Lordship cuts 'em to the Heart, and wou'd leave 'em Inconsolable, were it not that (as kind Providence wou'd have it) they find His Lordship's much weightier Affairs have hurried Him into some Mistakes; which, they make no Doubt, He will rectifie upon Advertisement; which I now humbly crave Leave to give.

In the *First* Place, As for Mr. *Rollock*. That He did neither Invent nor clandestinely Propagate such a Story, as His Lordship alledges, 'tis certain. By this Token, that Mr. *Rollock* was Dead, and,

and Rotten too, before the *Conspiracy*. Every one knows that *Gowry's Conspiracy* fell out *August 5th 1600*. But *Mr. Rollock* died in the Moneth of *February 1598*. Thus *Clerk* relates in *His Life*. Thus *Melchior Adams* relates in his *Lives of Forreign Divines*. Thus the Manuscript *Calderwood* in the University Library in *Glasgow* relates. Nay thus *Spotswood* relates in his History p. 454. And thus, I presume, every Body, else relates, that writes of *Mr. Rollock*.

For preventing Mistakes I must advertise the Reader, that, as *Spotswood* informs us p. 456, the Year among us used to begin at 25 *March*, till a Publick Ordinance was made, appointing that the Beginning of the Year 1600, and so on thence forward, shou'd be reckon'd from the first of *January* as now. 'Tis then no Objection against what I have advanced, tho' one find *Mr. Rollock* writing Books, or spoken of in History as living, in *January* or *February 1599*. The different Ways of Computation quite remove that Difficulty. And tho' Historians differ about the Day of the Moneth on which He died; *Spotswood* making it the last Day of *February*, whereas all the rest, whom I have seen, make it the eighth Day of that Moneth: Yet, that is not of any Import in this Case: For, even by the lowest Account, He was Dead at least *seventeen* Moneths before the *Conspiracy*; and therefore cou'd not, without a Miracle, Invent or Propagate false Stories concerning it.

2dly, His Lordship is in the like Mistake concerning *Mr. Dury*. For He died, as *Spotswood* also relates p. 457, upon the last Day of *February 1600*, that is to say, *five* Moneths and *five* Days before the *Conspiracy*, and so could not be Guilty.

These Observes, concerning *Rollock* and *Dury*, the Publick owes, not to me; but, to that Worthy Person and my very good Friend *Mr. Matthew Crawford* Minister at *Inchenan* in the Shire of *Renfrew*; who, in an accidental Conversation, first gave Me Notice of His Lordship's Book, and that He had observed the said Mistakes in it. Which Observes, upon Examination, I found to be Just.

His Lordship is not only out as to His reckoning, but is mistaken also in the Characters of the Men: For, they were so far from being DESIGNERS AGAINST THE ROYAL FAMILY; that, as *Spotswood* relates in the Places above cited, they spent their last
Breath,

Breath, *Rollock*, in exhorting His Brethren in the Ministry to carry dutifully towards the King; and *Dury*, in advising them to comply with His Majesty's Designs for restoring *Prelacy*.

I don't in the least incline to aggravate these his Lordships Mistakes. So much the less, that I find 'tis usual with great Men, when writing against the *Presbyterians*, to fall into the like. The famous Monsieur *Varillas* very gravely tells it as a Singularity * concerning *Buchanan*, that, *After having declared himself against his Sovereign Lady, so far as to go into England to depose against Her in the Criminal Process then depending, he continued to persecute her after she was beheaded. This, saith he, is a Crime which they, who are most partial in Favour of Buchanan, must own he was guilty of.* And yet after all this, 'tis certain, that *Buchanan* was not guilty of that Crime, for this good Reason, that he died some three or four Years before the Queen was beheaded. But there is a short and obvious Apology to be made for such Mistakes in *Varillas* or his Lordship, *Aquila non captat Muscas.* To go on.

3dly, As to Mr *Melvil*. 'Tis true he was on Life at that Time, yet I cannot find in any History that he was guilty of Inventing, Fomenting, or Propagating such a Story, or that he made any the least Noise about that Matter. His Lordship therefore wou'd oblige his Country, if he wou'd vouchsafe to give his Authors.

4thly, As to Mr *Bruce*. 'Tis true, he refused to give publick Thanks for the King's Deliverance from that Conspiracy, declaring, as *Spotswood* p. 461 relates, that he wou'd reverence His Majesty's Reports of that Accident, but could not say he was perswaded of the Truth of it: For which he was banish'd the King's Dominions, and went into France. But this is a very different Thing from what his Lordship charges him with. For, to suggest, that *Gowry* and his Brother did never conspire against the King, but that the King did murder them both, had been a Crime; because it was not possible, certainly to know that; and yet much less, to prove such a Suggestion. But to declare, that he could not say that he was perswaded of the Truth of the Conspiracy, which is all that the Historians of that Time charge him with, was, at the worst, but a Weakness; it not being in a Man's Power to believe a Story,

ry, but according to the Impression which the Grounds of it, and Credibility of its Circumstances, make upon his Mind. And no one knows better than his Lordship, that there are several Circumstances, in the Story of the *Conspiracy*, which are not so perfectly clear, but that they require Time to believe 'em: Tho' indeed, I think his Majesty's Testimony, with the Presumption that the Earl and his Brother were out of their Wits, as his Majesty, before the Attempt, suspected the Earl's Brother to be, is sufficient to determine the Matter. For what may not mad Men do? However it was, it does not appear that Mr *Bruce* was guilty of what his Lordship charges him with; there being a very great Odds betwixt Contradicting a Report, and being reverently silent about it.

5thly, As for other *Presbyterian Ministers* whom his Lordship indefinitely involves in the same Guilt. The Accusation can be of no Weight till his Lordship is pleased to name them. 'Tis true the Ministers of *Edinburgh*, viz. *Mrs. Walter Balcanqual*, *William Watson*, *James Balfour*, and *John Hall*, demurr'd at first to give Thanks for the King's Deliverance, upon this Excuse, as *Spotswood* p. 461. informs us, that, *they were not acquainted with the Particulars, nor how those Things had fall'n out*. But how soon they were inform'd of the Particulars of the *Conspiracy*, they complied. Now, implicate Faith having been cried down, ever since the Reformation, it seems hard to blame such a Conduct: And 'tis no less hard to blame *Presbyterian Ministers* for a Fault which was common to so many others at that Time; *Spotswood* telling us that *many doubted that there had been any such Conspiracy*. This may be sufficient for Vindication of the *Presbyterian Ministers* against his Lordship's Charge. I crave Leave only to add two Remarks more on his Lordships Book.

I. His Lordship p. 30, 31. has advanced a Piece of History in these Words. ' Upon the Information of *Henderson*, and other ' Witnesses, *Cranston* and *Craigengelt* were pannell'd before the ' Justiciary at *St. Johnstoun*; and upon clear Testimonies, and on ' their own Confession at the Bar (which they also adhered to ' on the Scaffold) they were both executed: Only alledging that ' they did not know of the Design to Murder the King; but that ' they intended to force the King to make great Reparations for the

‘ the late Earl of *Gowrie’s* Death ; and that this Earl of *Gowry* was
‘ to be made a great Man. Thus his Lordship.

But His Lordship has not thought fit to Document this; and *Spots-wood* who lived in the Time has flatly contradicted it in these Words p. 459 ‘ Another of *Gowrie’s* Servants surnamed *Craigenvelt* was
‘ some two days after apprehended, and both he and M. *Tho.*
‘ *Cranston* executed at *Perth* ; tho’ at their dying they declared that
‘ they knew NOTHING of the Earl’s purpose, and had ONLY
‘ followed him as being their Master unto that Room, where if they
‘ had known the King to have been, they wou’d have stood for him
‘ against their Master and all others. Thus *Spotswood*. I dont for
all this say, that the Earl of *Cromerty* is wrong : But if he is not,
certainly the Archbishop is.

II. His Lordship has also given us in his Book a large and particular Account of the *Process* and *Trial* of *Robert Logan* of *Restalrig*. No one will suspect His Lordship’s Exactness in the Extracts of the Documents of that Process which He has produced. But tho’ His Lordship’s Faithfulness is beyond Question, yet the Truth of the story it self is not. I shall give my Reason why I say so.

Spotswood was at that Time at Man’s Age, was Archbishop of *Glasgow*, was one of His Majesty’s Privy-Council, was upon the Scaffold when *Sprot* the Notary, from whom that whole Process flow’d, was hang’d, and signs the Account of *Sprot’s* Behaviour on the Scaffold, which we have p. 115 of His Lordship’s Book : *Spotswood*, I say, who was thus every way qualified to give Judgment upon and a true Narration of this Process ; Yet, in his History, tells the story in such a Manner, as wou’d tempt any Body shrewdly to suspect, that the whole Business was a Fiction. For thus His Words are p. 509.

‘ Whether or not I should mention the Arraignment and Execution of *George Sprot* Notary in *Eymouth*, who suffered at *Edinburgh* in the *August* preceeding, I am doubtfull ; his Confession, though voluntary and Constant carrying SMALL PROBABILITY. This Man had deponed, that He knew *Robert Logan* of *Restalrig*, who was dead two years before, to have been privy to *Gowrie’s* Conspiracy, and that he understood so much by a Letter that fell in his hand written by *Restalrig* to *Gowrie*, bearing
S f that

‘ that he would take part with Him in the Revenge of his Father’s Death, and that his best Courte shou’d be to bring the King by Sea to *Fascastle*, where He might be safely kept, till advertisement came from those with whom the Earl kept Intelligence. It seem’d a VERY FICTION, and to be a MEER INVENTION of the Man’s own Brain ; for neither did he shew the Letter, nor cou’d ANY WISE MAN think that *Gowry*, who went about that Treason so secretly, would have communicated the Matter with such a Man as this *Restalrig* was known to be. . . . Thus far His Grace, who, as we are told in his Life, *had not only the Use of all the Registers both of Church and State in Scotland, but of all Letters of State that cou’d any way concern the Work he was about.* And yet his account not only differs from his Lordship’s, but plainly contradicts it. ’Tis certain then there must be a Mistake somewhere, which I must leave to the Reader to judge upon as he lists.

I do not design by these two Remarks to derogate in the least from the Truth of the *Conspiracy*. For, in the Light wherein it now stands, I cannot conceive why any man shou’d suspect it. The Earl of *Gowry* used the *Black Art*, wore *Magicall* Spells in his Girdle, which His Lordship himself was once Master of, and has very well proved in his *Letter* to his *Printer* prefix’d to his Book. What Crime was not such a Person capable of ? His Brother’s whole Conduct in the Managment of the *Conspiracy* speaks him Frantick. For *1st*, That he shou’d have shut up *Henderson* in the Chamber in order to perpetrate the Murder, and yet not have told him before hand that this was the Design. *2^{dly}*, That after having held the Whinger to the King’s Breast, he shou’d have fall’n a parlying with him, and gone down stairs to consult with the Earl his Brother whether he shou’d murder Him or not. *3^{dly}*, That he shou’d have taken the King’s Promise not to open the Window or cry out till he shou’d return. *4^{thly}*, That when he had return’d and sworn *BY GOD there is no Remedy, you must die*; he shou’d have essay’d to tie the King’s Hands with a Garter, when, ’tis probable, he might have more easily dispatch’d Him without that Ceremony. Cou’d there be greater Symptoms of a Man Distemper’d in his Wits than these and a great many other Circumstances that might be added ? Why then shou’d we any longer

longer doubt whether a Man in *Compass* and his Brother *Non Compos* wou'd attempt the greatest Villany?

But then, both the Earl and his Brother had always, till that very Day, pass'd under the Character of Wise, Sober and Virtuous Gentlemen, *two Youths of great Hope*, says *Spotswood*, at whose Hands no Man cou'd have expected such an Attempt. Was it any Wonder then if Mr. Bruce, and the other Ministers of *Edinburgh* who demurr'd a little, cou'd not at first Dash be perswaded, that they had all of a sudden become, the One of 'em a Devil, t'other Distracted? 'Tis plain there was a Difficulty here: And this is more than enough to vindicate the *Presbyterian* Ministers. *Quod erat Faciendum.*

I go on with Mr. Rhind, and proceed to consider His Charge of *Rebellion*.

Thirdly, In K. Charles I's Time, I believe there is no wise Man will undertake to justify all that was done on either Side during those Troubles. The only Question is, who were the first Authors of them, and who gave the greatest cause of them?

Was it the *Scots Presbyterians*? My Lord *Hollis* has assolized 'em. 'Twas propos'd, saith he (l) that our Brethren of *Scotland* might be called in, who were known to be a wise People, Lovers of Order, firm to the Monarchy: Who had twice before gone through the Misfortune of taking up Arms, and wisely had laid them down again; still contenting themselves with that which was necessary for their Security, avoiding Extremities. Their Wisdom and Moderation, as was presumed, might then have delivered us from that Precipice of Misery and Confusion, into which our Charioteers were hurrying us amain. But these Men would none of it at that Time. Thus his Lordship.

Were not the *Scots Prelates* the first Authors of those Troubles? Did not they raise the Fire? Yes. *Gilbert Burnet* has expressly loaded them with it (m). 'Tis true, that Person has made a vigorous Appearance these twenty or thirty Years bygone against *Papery*, and in Behalf

S f 2

of

of the *Protestant* Interest, which is a Fault never to be forgiven, in this World or in the next, if some Mens Doom hold: And, on that Score, any Testimony he cou'd give *now*, since he was Bishop of *Sarum*, cou'd be of no Weight. But this Testimony he gave when he was plain *Gilbert Burnet*, and was as through pac'd in the Principles of *Passive Obedience* and *Non-resistance* as ever *Mr Dodwell* was, or *Mr Lestly* is. Plainly he tells, That the *Scots* Bishops, by reflecting on the *Reformers*, commending the Persons, and mollifying the Opinions of *Papists*, defending the *Arminian* Tenets, advancing a Liturgy without Law, provoking the Nobility by engrossing the King's Favour, crying down the Morality of the Sabbath and prophaneing it by their Practices, making themselves unsupportable to the Ministry by *Simoniacal* Pactions and encroaching upon their Jurisdictions, by relinquishing their Diocesses and meddling in all secular Affairs, and by advising the King to introduce Innovations into the Church without Consent of the Clergy. By these and such like Things, saith he, the *Scots* Prelates raised that Fire in the Nation which was not so easily extinguished.

Is there any other Account to be brought from *England*? No. Those of the greatest Character and most unshaken Loyalty have told the Story as to that Kingdom the very same Way. I shall produce two of them for the Purpose. The first is the Lord *Falkland* in his Speech before cited before the House of Commons, than which a more exact Piece of Eloquence with such rigid Truth even Ancient *Rome* Herself cannot boast of. ' Mr. Speaker, saith He, He is a great stranger in *Israel* who knows not that this Kingdom hath long laboured under many and great Oppressions both in Religion and Liberty. And His Acquaintance here is not great, or his Ingenuity less, who doth not both know and acknowledge that a great if not a *Principal* Cause of both these have been some *Bishops* and their Adherents.----The Reader may peruse the Rest at His Leisure. To Him let us add My Lord *Clarendon*, an avowed Enemy to the *Presbyterians*, an Author who hardly ever allows Himself to speak one good Word of any *Scots* Man; and who, even when He has the brightest Characters of our Nation a drawing, yet lays on the Shadowing so thick, that the Piece appears but a very indifferent one: Even this Noble Historian, I say, has expressly charged the Troubles of those Times upon the unaccountable

countable and fiery Measures of the Court and High Church Party. ' No less unjust Projects of all Kinds, saith He (n), many ridiculous, many Scandalous, all very grievous were set on Foot. The ' Council-Chamber and Star-Chamber held for Honourable that ' which pleased, and for just that which profited; and being the ' same Persons in several Rooms grew both Courts of Law to determine Right, and Courts of Revenue to bring in Money to the ' Treasury. The Council-Table by Proclamation enjoining to the ' People what was not enjoined by the Law, and prohibiting what was ' not prohibited; and the Star Chamber censuring the Breach of ' those Proclamations by very large Fines and Imprisonment. And p. 223. That ' there were very few Persons of Quality who had ' not suffered or been perplexed by the Weight and Fear of these ' Judgments and Censures; and that no Man cou'd Hope to ' be longer free from the Inquisition of that Court than he resolved to submit to extraordinary Courses. So much for the Court.

Was High Church more Innocent? No, on the contrary She was the great Spring of all. The same Lord Clarendon owns (o) That ' when Laud was made Archbishop (which was in 1633) ' it was a Time of great Ease and Tranquility: The King had ' made Himself Superior to all those Difficulties He had to contend ' with, and was now revered by all His Neighbours; the general Temper and Humour of the Kingdom little inclined to the ' Papist and less to the Puritan. The Church was not repined ' at, nor the least Inclination shewn to alter the Government or Discipline thereof, or to Change the Doctrine; nor was there at that ' Time any considerable Number of Persons of any valuable Condition throughout the Kingdom who did wish either. ' * And the Cause of so prodigious a Change in so few Years * N. B. ' after was too visible from the Effects. The Archbishop's ' Heart was set upon the Advancement of the Church &c. ... He never abated any Thing of His Severity and Rigour towards Men ' of all Conditions or in the Sharpness of His Language and Expressions. ... And that He entertain'd too much Prejudice to some Persons

‘ Persons as if they were Enemies to the Discipline of the Church,
 ‘ because they concurred with *Calvin* in some Doctrinal Points,
 ‘ when they abhorred His Discipline, and revered the Govern-
 ‘ ment of the Church, and prayed for its Peace with as much
 ‘ Zeal and Fervency as any in the Kingdom, as they made mani-
 ‘ fest in their Lives and in their Sufferings with it and for it. Thus
 He, and a great deal more to the same Purpose, for which any
 Body may consult the History it self. Say now, Good Reader, who
 were the first and greatest Causes of the Troubles in *K. Charles*
I’s Time?

But says *Mr. Rhind*, *They betrayed Him into the hands of his En-*
emies, when He had entrusted them with His sacred Person. Let us
 hear my Lord *Holles* upon this p. 68. ‘ The Wisdom of the *Scottish*
 ‘ Nation foresaw the Inconveniences which must have necessarily
 ‘ followed had they been positive at that Time, how they had play-
 ‘ ed their Enemies Game to their own Ruin, and even Ruin to His
 ‘ Majesty. Therefore they made for him the best Conditions they
 ‘ could, that is *for the safety and Honour of His Person*, and to avoid
 ‘ greater mischiefs were necessitated to leave Him in *England* and
 ‘ to march away. Here then the very Mouth of Iniquity was stop’d,
 ‘ malice it self had *Nothing* to say to give the least Blemish to the
 ‘ Faithfullness and Reality of the Kingdom of *Scotland*. Thus he.

Mr. Rhind urges, that *They entered into the Solemn League and*
Covenant, and in Pursuance of the design thereof brought Matters to
that Pass that the King’s Death was unavoidable. That the *English*
 Sectarians intended the *Solemn League* for Nothing else but a Decoy
 I firmly believe. ’Tis plain that *They*, with *Cromwell* their Ring-
 Leader, were as very Villains as ever trode God’s Earth, since the
 Days of *Judas*. But that the *Scots* entered into it upon the most
 Sincere and laudable Designs, the said Lord *Holles* has amply testify-
 ed. And that it was not the *Scots* entering into, but the *English*
 breaking of that *League* that was the Cause of the King’s Death is
 manifest as Light. And therefore the *Scots* justly reproached them
 with Breach of *Covenant* in all that they intended or acted against
 the King’s Person.

Thus, in the Paper of the 5th of *July*, 1648, which was given
 in

in to the Speaker of the House of *Commons* the Commissioners for the Kingdom of *Scotland* declared ‘ that they wou’d endeavour
 ‘ that the Rights and Priviledges of Parliament may be preserved,
 ‘ that there be no Change in the Fundamental Government, and
 ‘ that there be no Harm, Injury or Violence offered to His Majesty’s
 ‘ Person, the very Thought whereof the Kingdom of Scotland hath
 ‘ always abhorred, as may appear by all their Proceedings and De-
 ‘ clarations: And the Houses of Parliament have often upon fe-
 ‘ veral Occasions expressed a Detestation thereof in their Declara-
 ‘ tions. Wherefore we do expect that there shall be no proceed-
 ‘ ing against His Person, which cannot but continue and increase
 ‘ the great Distractions of these Kingdoms, and involve us in ma-
 ‘ ny Difficulties, Miseries and Confusions. Thus They. And
 according to this Declaration they made their Protest. Again

The Comissioners of the *General Assembly* Jan. 16. 1649. emit-
 ted their *Necessary and Solemn Testimony* against the Proceedings of
 the Sectaries wherein they have these Words. ‘ If after so many
 ‘ Publick Professions and Solemn Attestations to the contrary,
 ‘ the Foundation shall be razed, Monarchy be destroyed,
 ‘ and Parliaments subverted by an Imaginary and preten-
 ‘ ded Agreement of the People: As it wou’d destroy the *League* and
 ‘ *Covenant*, and cause the Adversary to Blaspheme and insult, so it
 ‘ cannot but be the Cause of many Miseries and Calamities unto
 ‘ these Kingdoms. Thus they. Once more.

Upon the 18 of *January* 1649. The *Estates of Parliament* gave a
Return upon the said *Testimony* wherein we have these Words.
 ‘ Therefore the Estates of Parliament, after diligent Enquiry at all
 ‘ the Members of this Court, upon their publick and solemn Oath both
 ‘ concerning themselves and others, do declare and can assure their
 ‘ Brethren of *England*, that they cannot find that either this King-
 ‘ dom or any Person thereof had any Knowledge of or Accession unto
 ‘ the late Proceedings of the *English* Army in Relation to the King’s
 ‘ Person or the Houses and retrained Members thereof, but are very
 ‘ Confident there is no Ground for such Aspersions. Thus they. And ac-
 cordingly they Instantly instructed their Commissioners that they
 should enter, in the Name of this Kingdom, their Dissent & Protest, That
 as this Nation is free from all Knowledge of and Accession to these Designs
 and

and Practices, so they may be free of all the Calamities, Miseries and Confusions which may follow thereupon to these Distracted Kingdoms.

These are the most Publick and substantial Evidences that possibly can be brought to document any Matter of Fact, and will I hope be allowed to be of somewhat more Weight, than the furious Declamations of Mr Rhind and such others of the like Veracity, who stick to assert Nothing, and yet cite not to prove anything. So much for K. Charles I's Time.

Fourthly in K. Charles II's Time. After the *English* had murdered the Father, the *Scots* proclaimed His Son King, invited him Home, crown'd and fought for him. And what thanks got they? Why the *Caviliers* were glad that They had left so many of their Carcasses at *Dumbar* and *Worcester*. And Mr. L---ly speaking of the *Seſtarians* (p) ' They bang'd, saith he, the *Presbyterians* heartily at *Dumbar* whose Word that Day was The COVENANT, ' the best Victory ever the King lost. Yet so obstinate were they in their Loyalty, that when the King had fled beyond Sea, and they were oppress'd with a raging Enemy in their Bowels, yet they still continued to own him, their Ministers prayed for him even in the Face of the *English* Forces, and encouraged and assisted General Monk to bring him home; and all this, notwithstanding they might have had their own Terms from *Cromwell* when he was in *Scotland*, in Case they wou'd have submitted. So untrue is it what Mr Rhind says, that *They were serving their own private Ends*.

But says he, ' They made the *Act of the West Kirk*, wherein they declared, that *They wou'd not own him nor his Interest otherwise than with a Subordination to God, and so far as he own'd and prosecuted the Cause of God, and disclaimed his and his Fathers Opposition to the Work of God and the Covenant*. Well. And was this a Cause why Mr Rhind should separate from the *Presbyterians*? With what Conscience then cou'd he join with the Church of England? 'Tis within the Memory of Man that the Prince of *Orange* came over to *England* in Opposition to K. *James*, and that upon the Invitation of the Lords *Spiritual* as well as *Temporal*. He sent his Declaration before him containing the

the Reasons and Intent of his coming. The King foresaw what a Storm was brewing, and how heavy it was like to fall on his Head. He called for the *Bishops*, and desired of 'em a Paper under their Hands in *Abhorrence* of the *Prince's* intended Invasi^on. Did they comply with this Desire? No. They, even the Loyal and afterwards Nonjuring Bishops, the Bishops who had carried the Doctrine of Loyalty to such an extravagant Height as had deluded the King into all those false steps of Government which ruin'd Him, even They, I say, flatly refused his desire; Yes, They refused it *when He besought them in the Anguish of his soul*. The *Episcopalians* are desired, always, when they tell the Story of the *Westkirk* Act, to tell this too as a Counterpart to it. *Salmasius* wrote false in the Case of King *Charles I.* when He wrote that the *Presbyterians* bound and the *Independents* killed the Sacrifice. Even *Milton* His Adversary, tho, a bitter Enemy of the *Presbyterians*, has observed (q) that, in saying so, He has contradicted Himself, having elsewhere wholly loaded the *Independents* with it. But 'tis plain beyond Denial, that in the Case of *K. James*, the *Episcopalians* both bound and killed the Sacrifice. For, *To be exposed and after live*, is something worse than Death. I am fully perswaded that what they did was absolutely necessary for preserving the Protestant Religion. But then 'tis a very immodest Thing in them to upbraid the *Presbyterians* with such Acts as themselves were guilty of. But to go on with *K. Charles II's* Reign.

'Tis true that a small Handfull of People, enraged with the most horrid Oppression, made an Insurrection first in the Year 1666 at *Pentland*, and afterwards in the Year 1679 at *Bothwell*. But first to exasperate Men with Cruel Usage, and then to upbraid them for resenting it, is the utmost Barbarity the most spirituell Nature can be guilty of, and that they were thus exasperated, simply upon the Account of Nonconformity, before the Rising at *Pentland*, I refer for Proof to a small Tract entituled *A short Memorial of the Grievances and sufferings of the Presbyterians in Scotland since the year 1660*. But indeed we need not refer to any Book, there are many Thousands yet living who remember it to their Cost.

T t

So

So much for K. Charles II's Time, and as much as is necessary for K. James VII's Time.

In the Present and Preceeding Reigns Mr. Rhind Himself cannot charge them with Rebellion; but He falls a *Prophefying* that they wou'd Rebell if put to the Trial, and if their Interest did not oblige them to live in Peace. This is one of His *Visionary Flights*, so necessary to make up Dryden's Character of the English Corah.

*Some future Truths are mingled in His Book,
And where the Witness fail'd, the Prophet Spoke.*

But if Mr. Rhind act the *Prophet* upon the *Presbyterians*, may not I act the *Historian* upon the *Episcopalians*. I gave a Hint before of their new Liturgy. Now hear their *Intercession* in it. *We pray Thee to be Gracious to our Prince, who for the Sins both of Priests and People, is now kept out. --- Raise Him Friends abroad, convert or confound the Hearts of His Enemies at Home. -- And by the secret Windings and Powerfull Workings of thy Providence, make the Stone which these foolish Builders have rejected, the Head Stone of the Corner.* Was not this a very loyall Prayer? And has not their Practice been agreeable? For, whence all the Insurrections under Dundee, Cannon and Buchan? Whence the *Affassination Plot* against K. William? I doubt not, but They'll affirm all those Efforts were acts of Loyalty, and so I'm sure the worst of Rebels generally Excuse themselves. Even Satan himself does not usually shew His Horns or put forth his cloven Foot. But enough of this part of the charge. And to conclude it, 'tis very true, the *Presbyterians* do not ascribe an unlimited Power to any Prince on Earth. And, for my own Part, I freely declare, that an unlimited Power, without an unlimited Wisdom to direct it, and an unlimited Goodness to qualify it, raises a more frightfull Idea in Me than is that of the Devil himself. Let the *Episcopal Party* make as much of this as they ever can.

VIII. He charges Them p. 216. with a Spirit of *Division*, which, saith He, drives them from the Communion of the Church, and cuts them off from the ordinary Communications of the Holy Ghost. For Answer, 'tis true, it drives them from the Communion of Mr. Rhind's Church: And I hope a Mercifull God will still keep Them and every good

good Christian from such a Communion ; a Communion, as I have shewen, so absolutely void of the Spirit of Charity, that we are as sure 'tis not the Spirit of Christ by which they are acted, as we are sure that Christ the Son of God taught Charity. And ' better it ' were (as Archbishop Tillotson has most truly taught) (r) there ' were no reveal'd Religion, and that Human Nature were left ' to the Conduct of its own principles and Inclinations, which are ' much more mild and mercifull, much more for the Peace and ' Happiness of Human Society ; than to be acted by a Religion that ' inspires Men with so vile a Fury and prompts them to commit ' such Outrages. This then is the only Answer needs be given, That the more the Spirit of Presbytry drives People from Mr. Rhind's Church, the more it drives them into the Church of Christ.

He adds further That, *this their Spirit throws them (like the Demoniack in the Gospel) sometimes into the fire and oft into the Water.* By this I suppose He means that they are sometimes divided among themselves, which indeed in the former Times of Presbytry was too true, and I believe They all desire to be humbled for it before God ; and I hope the present Generation will make so good a Use of the Failings of their Fathers as to keep united among themselves *henceforth*, as they have done *hitherto* to the great Mortification of their Adversaries. The best of Men will differ in some Things both as to Judgment and Practice. But I hope we shall never *differ* so far as to *divide*.

*Non eadem sentire Bonos de rebus iisdem
Incolumi licuit semper Amicitia.*

In the mean Time it is shamelessly immodest in a Man that pretends to have join'd the Church of England, to upbraid the Presbyterians with their Divisions. For pray what has Low-Church and High Church been doing these Score of Years bypast, but damning each other, and separating from other ? What have the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation been doing, but managing a

T t 2

Civil

Civil War in the most furious Manner, the latter accusing the former of *Treachery*, and the former upbraiding the latter with Ecclesiasticall *Rebellion*? If Mr. Rhind knows Nothing of this, I recommend to his Perusal the Books cited on the Margin (s):

--- *Tantane animis cœlestibus ira?*

IX. In the last Place, He charges the *Presbyterians* p. 216, 217. with an Unneighbourly, Cruel and Barbarous Spirit, Not an ' That they slander their Catholick Neighbours, ex-
Unneigh- ' ert their ill Nature in a special Manner against their
bourly, Cru- ' Ecclesiastical Superiors, pry into their Lives, and ag-
elior Barba- ' gravate their Frailties, gladly hearken to, readily be-
rous Spirit. ' lieve, and zealously propagate the most idle, false and
' malicious Stories of them. I know no other Answer
this needs, but that it is an idle, false and malicious Representation:
And when he subjoins his Proof, it will be Time enough to make
a more particular Reply.

In the mean Time he hints at *Five Things* which are to be taken
some Notice of *viz.* 1st, the Conduct of the *General Assembly* in
1638. 2^{dly}, The Attempts made upon the Lives of Bishops. 3^{dly}, The
bar-

[s] Rights of an *English Convocation*. Reflections on that Book. The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods. Appeal to all the true Members of the Church of *England* in Behalf of the Kings Ecclesiastical Supremacy. Answer to that Appeal. The Rights, Liberties and Authorities of the Christian Church asserted. Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of *England* historically stated. The Principles of Mr. *Aitbury's* Book considered. Remarks upon the Temper of the late Writers about Convocations. Occasional Letter on the Subject of *English Convocations*. A Letter to a Friend in the Country concerning the Proceedings of the present Convocation. The Power of the lower House of Convocation to adjourn itself vindicated from the Misrepresentations of a late Paper. Narrative of the Proceedings of the lower House of Convocation relating to Prorogations and Adjournments. The Right of the Archbishop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation. Vindication of the Proceedings of the Members of the lower House with Relation to the Archbishop's Prorogation of it. Letter to a Clergy Man in the Country concerning the Choice of Members &c. The Case of the *Premunientes* consider'd. Third Letter to a Clergy Man in the Country in Defence of what was said in the two former about the Entry of the Parliament Writ in The Journals of the Convocation &c. History of the Convocation 1700. History of the *English Councils and Convocations*; and of the Clergy sitting in Parliament. A faithful Account of what pass'd in the Convocation in three Letters. An Expedient proposed. Narrative of the lower House vindicated from the Exceptions of a Letter &c. The Right of the Archbishop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation. Vindication continued. Reconciling Letter upon the late Difference about Convocational Rights and Proceedings. Faithfull Account. The present State of Convocation in a Letter. The Case of the *Schedule* stated. The *Schedule* reviewed. The Parliamentary Original and Rights of the lower House of Convocation cleared. *Synodus Anglicana*. The New Danger of *Presbytry*. A short State of some present Questions in Convocation. A Summary Defence of the lower House of Convocation. A Letter from a Convocation-Man in *Ireland* to a Convocation Man in *England*. The State of the Church and Clergy of *England* in their Councils, Synods, Convocations &c. *Cum multis alijs*.

barbarous Murder of that *Venerable old Man* the Archbishop of *St. Andrews*. 4^{thly}, The Rabbling so many Ministers at the *Revolution*. And lastly, The Deposing so many of them by the Church Judicatories. These are the particular Grounds of his Charge, and I shall consider each of 'em in Order.

First. As for the Conduct of the *General Assembly* Anno 1638. He complains that *They trode under Foot the Bishops of the Church, and pretended to excommunicate them, while they were without the Communion of the Church themselves*. To which 'tis answered 1st, That they themselves cou'd not ~~be~~ *without the Communion of the Church* even by Mr *Rhind's* own Principles: For, they were generally, if not all of 'em, *Episcopally* ordain'd, and no Sentence had as yet past against them declaring them *Schismatics*, when they Deposed all, and Excommunicate the most Part of the Bishops. 2^{dly}, That they had just Reason to depose, and upon their Obstinacy to Excommunicate them, *Gilbert Burnet* has assured us. For, if they were guilty of crying down the Morality of the Sabbath, and prophaneing it by their Practices; if they were guilty of *Simoniackal* Pactions, of relinquishing their Diocesses and introducing Innovations without Law, without Consent of the Church; who can be so harden'd as to deny that such Persons were justly dealt with? How cou'd they be *Governours* of the Church who were not worthy to be Members of it?

Secondly, As to the Attempts made by them upon the Lives of Bishops. I suppose he means by this *Mitchel's* wounding the Bishop of *Orkney* in the Arm with a Pistol shot Anno 1668. It was no doubt a most unjustifiable Act. But is the Body of the *Presbyterians* to be charged with it? Hear himself in his Letter after he was sentenced to die. 'I adventured on it, *saieth he* (c), from my own pure and proper Motion without the Instigation of any, yea without so much as the *Privy* of any of that Party; whom therefore, I earnestly desire that none may charge with it. And if any shall, I do with Confidence averr, that they deal with them *most unjustly*. Thus &c. This, I hope, is sufficient to vindicate the *Presbyterians*. Mr *Rhind* is desired to vindicate the *Episcopalians* in taking his Lite upon his Extrajudicial Con.

Confession, after he had emitted it upon the publick Faith that it should not be brought in Judgment against him.

Thirdly. As to the Murder of that venerable old Man the Archbishop of St Andrews. 'Tis acknowledged that the killing of him (whoever did it) was Murder, and a most barbarous Murder. But I crave Leave to put in a Word *first* upon the Bishop's Character. *Secondly*, upon the Weight of the Argument, supposing *Presbyterians* had been the Murderers. And *Thirdly* upon the Truth of that Alledgance.

As for the *First* viz. The Bishop's Character. 'Tis true he was an Old Man: There is no denying of it, and therefore the Fact was the more inexcusable. Nor shall we grudge him the Style of *Venerable*. *In Titulis Honorarijs non est Falsitas*. Why may not even a *Festus* be called *Most Noble*? But then as to the Moral Part of his Character, I suppose his best Friends cannot deny but that he was guilty of the greatest *Perfidy* a Man cou'd be guilty of. The Question now is not, Whether *Prelacy* or *Presbytry* be the right Government; but whether *Treachery under Trust* be a Vice or a Virtue, a Crime or Commendable Practice. If Mr *Sharp* was under Convictions that the *Presbyterians* were wrong, and thereupon had design'd to revolt from them; as no Body cou'd have hindered him, so no Body cou'd have blamed him any further than some Hundreds of his Brethren who did the same. But to undertake the Management of the whole *Presbyterian* Interest which was then lying at Stake, to give the most solemn Promises to be faithfull in it; yea, to take their Money for bearing his Charges in that Service; and yet after all, instead of managing that, to manage over the *Primacy* to himself; this was so very Foul an Act, that as I'm sure it cannot be justified, so I doubt if it can be paralleled.

Whether he was guilty of other Things which were afterwards laid to his Charge, I shall not say: But I hope I may be allowed to tell a Story which Church of *England* Men have published to the World. Mr *L--ly* has given the World an Account (*v*) of a certain History yet unpublished, and therefore called by him *The Secret History*, but by the Author himself *The History of his own Time*. This *Secret* Historian, who was no *Presbyterian*, but of an eminent Cha-

Character in the Church of *England* tells us, ‘ That one of the Murderers fired a Pistol at the Bishop which burned his Coat and Gown, but the Shot did not go into his Body, upon which a Report was afterwards spread, that he had purchased a *Magical Secret* for securing him against Shot, and his Murderers gave it out that there were very suspicious Things found in a Purse about him. This was the dismal Fate of that unhappy Man who certainly needed a little more Time to have fitted him for an unchangeable State. But I wou’d fain hope that he had all his Punishment in that terrible Conclusion of his Life. Thus far the *Secret Historian* as reported by Mr L-ly.

2dly, Supposing *Presbyterians* had been the Murderers, Of what *Weight* would that Alledgance be against the Body of that Communion, or against the *Presbyterian* Principles? How many ill Things are done every Day in every Nation by Professed Christians? But were it just to load the whole Christian Church with them, or to impute them to the Spirit of Christianity? It is equally unjust to load *Presbytry* with the Bishop’s Murder. And to much the more, that the *Secret Historian* just now cited tells us, *that the Murderers* (who ever they were) *had not resolved on doing this any Time before; but, seeing His Coach appear alone in the Moor, they took their Resolution all on a sudden.* But

3dly, Is it true that *Presbyterians* were the Murderers? Mr L-ly tells us (x) of a *Narrative* that was published shortly after committing the Fact, wherein it is said ‘ That *Five* of their Accomplices, ‘ *Complotters and Abettors of the Murder chose to die, and to be hung up in Chains upon the place, rather than confess the Sinfulness of the Action by acknowledging it was Murder or a Sin.* This I suppose is the best Evidence for charging the Fact upon the *Presbyterians*, and Mr L-ly triumphs upon it. Now, ’tis very true there were *Five* Men put to Death on *Magus Moor* (where the Bishop was Murdered) on that Account, and all the *Five* own’d themselves *Presbyterians*. But now let us hear them in their last Words, while they were upon, or at the Foot of the Ladder, just a stepping into Eternity.

Andrew Sword. ‘ The Bishop of *St Andrews* Death I am free of, having lived four or five Score of Miles from this, and never was

was

‘ was in this Place before : neither did I *ever* see a Bishop in the Face that I knew to be a Bishop.

James Wood. ‘ As for our coming here upon the Account of the Bishop’s Death: For my own Part, I was *never* in this Place of the Country before ; neither ever saw I a Bishop in my life, that I cou’d say there was the Man.

John Waddel. ‘ As for my Accession to the Bishop’s Death wherefore we are sentenced to die in this Place, I declare I was *never* Over the Water of *Forth* in this Country before this Time.

Thomas Brown. ‘ Some of you may judge our dying and hanging here is upon the Account of the Bishop’s Death, and that I was ‘ accessary thereunto. But I must tell you as to that, that I was ‘ *never* in this Country before this Time.

John Clyde. ‘ I shall say no more but only two or three Words anent the Thing I was accused of by those that pursued me, and ‘ that was the King’s Advocate and Bishop *Sharp*’s Brother, anent ‘ the Bishop’s Killing. --- I wish the Lord may not lay it to ‘ their Charge. For I *never* saw that Man whom They called ‘ the Bishop of *St Andrews* that I knew by another Man.

Thus these *Five Men* who ventured their Eternity upon their Innocence as to the Bishop’s Death. Whether the *Episcopalians* can purge themselves of their Innocent Blood, I leave it to their own Consciences. So much for the *Presbyterians* Barbarous Usage of Bishops.

But can *High-Church* purge Her self of using Bishops Barbarously? Who then were they that assaulted the Bishop of *Worcester*, broke His Coach Windows, pelted, abused, and put him in Danger of his Life? Does not the forecited Mr. *Bisset* tell us p. 8. that it was *High Church*. Who was it call’d Archbishop *Grindall* a *perfidious Prelate* from the Pulpit. Is Dr. *Sacheverell* a Presbyterian? Who was it wrote all the scurrilous Lampoons against Bishop *Burnet* viz. *Salt for the Leach*. *Sham Sermon dissected*. *Good old Cause*. *Proper Defence*. *Evil be Thou my Good* ! Is Mr. *L--ly* Presbyterian? Who is it affirms *That the Spirit of Grace is conferred in Baptism after a Manner which neither Bishop Burnet nor the Author of the Dialogues between the Curate and the Country-Man knows any Thing of?*

Is

Is Mr. Barclay Presbyterian (y)? Who says that all that Bishop Burnet preached in 1688. was not Gospel? Is Mr. G.-n Presbyterian? But I shou'd never come to an End, shou'd I touch upon every Thing *High-Church* has both said of, and done to Bishops these Score of Years bypast. Had Mr. Rhind then no Shame to charge us with the Abusing of Bishops? Let such as have abused them be, all reckon'd *Presbyterians*, and I'm sure we shall be *fifty thousand* stronger than we are ordinarily reckon'd to be. But I proceed.

Fourthly, As to the *Rabbling* so many of their Clergy in the Beginning of the *Revolution*. 'Tis true, some of them were *Rabbled* out, and no Man can or ought to undertake to Justify the Rabble in doing so. But had not the Clergy exasperated them to the greatest Height? How often had the Government, upon their Delation, or by their Instigation, driven the poor People's Cattle, shut up their Shops, spoil'd their Goods, imprison'd their Persons, squeez'd the Marrow out of their Bones with *Boots* and *Thumbkins*, Hang'd up their Husbands, Fathers, Brothers, and other Relations, and all this upon the Account of *Nonconformity*? 'Tis true, the People ought to have forgiven them all these Injuries, as indeed generally they did. But was it to be expected, but that *Corruption* in some of 'em wou'd prevail over *Principle*, or, that, upon a Turn of Affairs, their Resentment wou'd not vent it self against the Authors of these Injuries? I don't talk without book when I say the Clergy were the Authors of these Injuries. No. Dr. *Canaries* will Justify me beyond the need of other Documents, which yet might be produced by Hundreds. The *Doctor*, when lately return'd from *Rome*, Published in the Year 1684. a Book entituled *A Discourse representing the Sufficient Manifestation of the Will of God &c.* which He Dedicated to the Earl of *Perth* then *Chancellour*: Therein p. 187. He draws the *Presbyterians* in all the odious Characters that Malice cou'd devise, as *light and wild Extravagants, the very Dregs and Feculency of Mankind, on the Account both of their Birth and Breeding, but especially so, because of their very Souls and Immoralities; as being such a Herd of dull and untractable and whining and debauch'd Animals as scarcely go beyond those of the Hogs and Goats, which ever any of*

U u

them

them was ever born for to attend. Thus He. Now when he had thus dressed them up in the Skins of Brutes, was it not natural that the next step shou'd be to set the Dogs at 'em to worry 'em? Yes, that He does with a Witnesh. He is at so much Pains to Smooth over all the Severities of the Government against them, that he reckons *Hanging* it self but a Triffle. *The Worst*, says he p. 192, *is to be flung over a Ladder, or for one's Neck to be tyed to a Beam, and then to have a Sledge driven out under Him.* Was there ever a clearer Comment than this upon *Solomon's Words The tender Mercies of the Wicked are Cruel?* Was it any Wonder that People were Irritated against such *Furies?* As the Clergy then excited the Government to those Severities, so they have justified them ever since, and complain'd that our Princes were too Mercifull. Thus Mr. Rhind in His *Sermon on Loyalty* Preached and Printed 1711. speaking of K. Charles I. Others again (saith he p. 49, 50) find Fault with His too great Clemency and Indulgence; and truly I must own that THIS was his Fault: And indeed there is TOO MUCH of it in the Blood of his Family --; Of such a Gospel Strain are the *Episcopal Sermons!*

But why are the *Presbyterians* alone charged with Rabbling? Do the *Episcopalians* know nothing of that Trade? Did Mr Rhind never hear of *Sacheverell's* Mobs, and the burning down the *Disfenter's* Meeting-Houses? Did he never hear of the Rabbling Mr *Tullidaff* at *Errol* May 10, 1691? Did he never hear of the Rabble at *Old-Dier* (z)? Did he never hear of the *Episcopal* Treatment of Mr *Chisholm* in *March* 1711 sent to read the *Presbytry's* Edict for planting the vacant Church of *Gearloch* (a)? No *Pagan* History can furnish such an Instance of Barbarity. But why do I insist on Particulars? Even under K. *William's* Reign, their Rabblings were so frequent, that the Parliament found it needfull to make a very strict Act against them (b) And even notwithstanding that, They are still continued with the greatest Insolence, wherever they can hope to make any Hand with them. Is it not modest then in the *Episcopalians*

[z] See the present State of Parties. p. 184. [a] See State of Parties. p. 171. [b] See Act 11, Sess. 7. Parl. K. William.

lians to object Rabbling to the *Presbyterians* ? In the *Episcopalians*, I say, who *persecute* while they are *in*, and *Rabble* when they are *out*.

Lastly, As to the Deposing so many of their Clergy by Church Judicatories. Let us hear Dr *Edwards* an Eminent Divine of the Church of *England* in his Sermon on the *Union*, concerning the present establish'd Church of *Scotland*. ' They have, *saith he*, with the Patience of *Confessors* and *Martyrs* (and such a great Number of them were) born the sufferings which the *High-Church* Men brought upon them, and now when they are able to retaliate, they study not Revenge, but let the World see, they can *forgive* as well as *suffer*. ' This Testimony is of some more Weight than Mr *Rhina's* malicious Insinuations. I suppose the *Presbyterians* will be able to defend themselves upon a Condescendence on Particulars. In the mean Time the difference between the *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian* Conduct in this is pretty remarkable. In the Year 1662, three hundred Presbyterian Ministers were Turned out of their Churches simply upon the Account of *Nonconformity*, because they wou'd not receive *Collation* from the Bishop (upon a *Presentation* from the *Patron*) without any other Fault proven or alledged against them. At the *Revolution* there was not one Man of the *Episcopal* Clergy either *deprived* or *disposed* upon the Account of his Principle concerning Church Government. Say, Good Reader, which of these two Ways of acting was the more Christian and accountable ? At the *Restoration*, nor one Man, that I can hear of, was left in Possession of any Church in *Scotland*, who either had not *Episcopal Orders*, or at least received *Collation* from the Bishop. At the *Revolution* above two Hundred of the *Episcopal* Clergy were still continued in their Charges, many of which are alive, and in Possession at this Day, tho' in many Places Insolent to the last Degree in their Behaviour against the Establish'd Church. So that, if those who were still kept in, those who voluntarily dimitted, those who were deprived by the *Council* upon the Account of their Disloyalty, those who were outed by Act of Parliament April. 25 1690 Restoring the *Presbyterian Ministers* who were thrust from their Charges since the first of January 1661 : when all these I say are deduced, with those that complied, and, upon doing so, were assumed, I suppose the Number of the *Disposed* will appear very small. And if

Mr Rhind can prove them to have been innocent, I doubt not but He will oblige them and his whole Party. Let me only add, that a severe Treatment of Ministers is the Thing in the World a Church of *England-Man* shou'd be most loath to upbraid others with, as knowing how easie it is to reply. Were not *three hundred* Ministers deposed, deprived, excommunicated, imprison'd or banished in *two Years Time* after the Conference at *Hampton Court 1603* simply for Nonconformity to the Liturgy, tho' otherwise they were *Episcopally* ordain'd (c)? Were not *two Thousand* Ministers ejected at once by the *Bartholemew Act 1662* (d)? All the *Protestant Churches in Europe* put together cannot, I suppose, furnish so many Instances of Ministers deprived or deposed on any Account whatsoever, as *England* can for simple Nonconformity to Prelacy and paultry Ceremonies. Tho' then the deposing or depriving of Clergy-Men might have tempted Mr Rhind to separate from the *Presbyterians*, yet had not his Affection been much more partial, than his Conscience was nice, He had never been, on that Account, sway'd to the *Episcopal* side, which has been vastly more guilty. So much for the *Unneighbourly, Cruel and Barbarous Spirit* of the *Presbyterians*.

Thus I have gone through all the Particulars of Mr Rhind's Charge, wherein he essays to make the *Presbyterian Spirit* diametrically opposite to that of the Gospel. Every Reader, I suppose, will easily discern the Difference 'twixt his *Accusation* and my *Defence*. The *Accusation* (tho' that is always an odious Part) is neither qualified nor proven. The *Defence* is made good, and the *Charge* disproved from the very Books the *Accuser* appeals to, or by the Testimony of the most eminent *Episcopalians*.

And now to come to an End, who can but pity Mr Rhind? Who, besides the *SCHISM, HEREST, and SUPERSTITION* he has run into, has brought himself under the crying Guilt of the most wretched *PROPHANENESS* and *IMPIETY* against GOD, and the most malicious *CALUMNY* against his Neighbours and Benefactors. I
heartily

heartily wish he may Repent of this his Wickedness, and pray GOD, if perhaps the Thoughts of his Heart may be forgiven him.

UPON the whole I conclude, that the *PRESBYTERIAN GOVERNMENT* is of Divine Institution. Their *ARTICLES OF FAITH* taught by the Scripture, and believed by the Catholick Church. Their *WORSHIP* Pure and Perfect in all Essentials. And their *SPIRIT* and *Practice* at least as becoming the Gospel as that of their Neighbours.

THE END.

T H E C O N T E N T S.

The INTRODUCTION P. 1.

CHAP. I.

Containing *Preliminary Remarks* P. 2.

S E C T. I.

Containing *Remarks* on the Title of Mr *Rhind's* Book. Ib. Remark I. That the Title of an *APOLOGY* was ill chosen, the Book it self wanting the Apostolick Requisites of an *Apology* viz. *Meekness* and *Fear*. Ib. This proved from his Character of the *Presbyterians*, which is shewn to be *Malicious* p. 3. *False* p. 3, 4. Truly and indeed the Character of *High Church*. p. 4, 5. Remark II. Upon his concealing what Church it is whose Communion he has embraced. p. 5. Proved, That there is no Church on Earth whose Communion he can in Reason claim to. p. 5--11.

S E C T. II.

Containing *Remarks* on Mr. *Rhind's* Preface p. 11. Remark I. On the Date and Motive of his separating from the *Presbyterians*. Ib. Remark II. On his own Character of his Book p. 13. Its true Character, *Vanity* Ib. *Dogmaticalness*. p. 14. *Profaneness* Ib. Remark III. On his bespeaking Civil Usage for himself p. 15. Remark IV. Whether Mr *Rhind* is the true Author of the *Apology* Ib. See also the Preface. p. 7.

S E C T. III.

Containing *Remarks* on his *Narrative* of the Manner how he separated from the *Presbyterians* p. 16.

Remark I. Demonstrated that his *Narrative* is pure Poesy p. 16--20. Remark II. The dreadful Consequences (upon his own Principles) of his having been baptiz'd by a *Presbyterian* Minister p. 21. Remark III. That he does not ascribe to GOD his separating from the *Presbyterians* p. 22. Remark IV. On his mentioning his Obligations to the *Presbyterians* Ib. Remark V.

That

The Contents

That he refused the Communion of the Church of *Rome* on a Quarrel which equally obliges him to refuse Communion with the Church of *England*. p. 23. Remark VI. Upon his charging the *Presbyterians* with Want of Respect to the *Fathers* p. 24. Remark VII. Upon his Character of the *Episcopal* Authors p. 26. Remark VIII. Character of Mr. *Dodwell* p. 27. and of Mr. *Sage* p. 31.

A short *Digression* on the late *Vindication* of the *Fundamental Character* of *Presbytry* p. 32.

Chap II.

MR. *Rhind*'s first Reason for separating from the *Presbyterians* viz. That they are *Schismatics* in point of Government, Examined. p. 36.

S E C T. I.

His Principles and Corollaries examined. Ib. They are not admitted by the *Presbyterians* p. 37. Much less by the Church of *England* p. 38. Proved, That if the *Presbyterians* are *Schismatics*, *eo ipso* it will follow that they are not without the Church. p. 41.

S E C T. II.

His State of the Debate betwixt the *Presbyterians* and *Episcopalians* Examined. p. 43.

S E C T. III.

His Arguments for *Prelacy* summ'd up. p. 47.

S E C T. IV.

His Arguments for proving that *Christ* and his *Apostles* were under a Necessity of Instituting a *Prelatical* Form of Government Examined. p. 48.

ART. I. His Argument from the *Nature of the Thing* for proving that Necessity, Examined. p. 49.

Proved that the Argument 1st, is not *Modest* p. 50. 2^{dly}, not *Secure*, Ib. 3^{dly}, that it is *impertinent* as he has laid it p. 51. His Enforcement of that Argument 1st, from the *British* Monarchy p. 51. 2^{dly}, from the Principles of the *Presbyterians* p. 53. 3^{dly}, From their *Practice* p. 55. The *Presbyterian* Flat Form justified from the *Roman Senate*, the two Houses of *Parliament* and the Court of *Session* in *Scotland*, p. 59.

ART. II. The Argument from the Form of Government in the *Jewish* Church for proving that Necessity, Examined p. 60.

Proved,

The Contents.

Proved, that as he has laid it, it is horridly *Impious* p. 61. that his Managment of it against the *Presbyterians* is Ridiculous p. 62. That it is in it self weak, and concludes Nothing to the Purpose in this Controversy p. 64. That if it conclude at all it concludes for an universal *Papacy* p. 65. That it is rejected as *Insufficient* by the *Episcopal* Authors p. 67.

ART. III. The Argument from *Political Considerations* in Compliance with the *Jews* and *Romans* for proving that *Necessity*, Examined. p. 69.

Proved 1st, as to the *Jews* p. 70. 2^{dly}, as to the *Romans* p. 71. that the Argument so far as it concludes makes directly for *Presbytry*. The Design of the Argument from *Political Necessity* discovered p. 73.

S E C T. V.

The Proofs for evincing that *Prelacy* actually was instituted, Examined. p. 73.

The Institution of it not to be found in the *Scripture* confessed by Mr. *Dodwell* p. 74.

ART. I. The Proof for evincing that *Prelacy* obtain'd in *Christ's* days, Examined p. 75.

Proved that then the *Christians* were under no Form of Church-Government distinct from the *Jewish* Ib. That neither the XII nor the LXX were *Church Officers* till after *Christ's* Resurrection; Or, supposing they had been such, that yet they had both the same Power. p. 77.

The Text *Matth. XX. 25.* The *Princes of the Gentiles* &c. largely vindicated p. 79.

ART. II. The Proof for evincing that *Prelacy* obtain'd in the Days of the Apostles, Examined. p. 87.

Proved that if the Government which at first obtain'd among *Christians* as such was unalterable (as Mr. *Rhind* says it was) then *Prelacy* is ruin'd, Ib. Mr. *Rhind's* General Reasonings from the *Acts* and *Epistles* Examined. p. 88. A Succession in the *Apostolate* clearly disproved p. 90. Harangues against *Parity* how ridiculous p. 98. The Civil War amongst the *Episcopal* Authors p. 99. The Demonstration for *Prelacy* from its being confirm'd by *Miracles*, Examined p. 100. See also p. 93, 94.

ART.

The Contents.

ART. III. The Argument from the *Episcopacy* of *Timothy* and *Titus*, Examind p, 103.

Proved from Scripture that they were extraordinary *Officers* p. 104. Mr *Dodwell* confesses it, p. 105. The *Postscripts* no proof Ib. The *Ancients* of the three first Centuries perfectly silent of their being *Bishops*. p. 106. Their *Episcopacy* cannot be inferred from any Thing in the *Epistles* directed to them. p. 107

ART. IV. The Proof from the *Apocalyptick Angels* Examind. p, 110.

Those *Angels* not the fixed *Bishops* of these Churches p. 111. Not numbred by *Seven* Ib. Not Characterized as single Persons confessed by Dr *More* and Mr *Dodwell* and proved at large from the II. and III. Chap. of the *Rev.* p. 112. Proved to be False, that all Ancient and Modern *Commentators* have supposed these *Angels* to be single persons and the Governours of the Churches p. 118. *Biza* has said nothing on this Argument that favours the *Episcopal* Cause p. 120. Dr *Hammond's* Scheme intirely ruins this Argument Ib. as it also does the argument from the *Jewish* Priesthood, and from the Subordination of the LXX to the XII. This noticed and confessed by Dr *Whitby*. p. 121.

ART. V. The Testimonies for *Prelacy* from *Antiquity* Examind. p.

121. Dr *Bed ll* and *Medina* confess the *Fathers* to be on the *Presbyterian* Side Ib. Dr *Sherlock's* and *Chillingworth's* Judgment of the weight of the Testimony of the *Fathers* p. 122.

Ignatius's Epistles discoursed p. 123. Proved in four particulars that they quite destroy the Modern *Episcopacy* and the Principles on which it is built. Ib. Proved that as to the main of the Controversy they contain nothing contrary to the *Presbyterian* Scheme. p. 126. No Evidence that the *Ignatian Presbyters* did Preach or administer the Sacraments p. 128. Proved that the *Ignatian Epistles* are either not *Genuine*; or at least are *vitiated* and *Interpolated*. p. 132.

Clemens Romanus gives no Testimony for *Prelacy* p. 144.

Nor the Emperour *Adrian*. p 147.

Nor *Irenaeus* p 148.

Nor *Tertullian* p 150.

ART. VI. The Argument for *Prelacy* from the *Impossibility* of its

The Contents.

obtaining so early and universally, if it had not been of *Divine Institution* Examn'd p 151.

Proved that such an *Impossibility* cannot be inferred either 1st, From the *Piety and Zeal* of the *Primitive Times* p. 152. Nor 2^{dly}, from the *Universal spread* of *Episcopacy* p 154. Nor 3^{dly}, from the *Vigilance* of the *Governours* of the *Church* p 155. Nor 4^{thly}, from the *Unparallel'dness* of the *Case* p. 156. Nor 5^{thly}, from the *No Opposition* was made to the *Change* p 157.

Testimonies for *Presbytry* from *Antiquity* p 159.

From *Clemens Romanus* Ib. *Ignatius* p 160. *Polycarp* p 161. *Justin Martyr* Ib. *Irenæus* Ib. *Tertullian* p 162. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Ib. *Origen* p. 163. *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*. p. 164. *Cyprian*. Ib. *Basilius Magnus* p. 165. *Aerius*. Ib. *Ambrose*. p. 166. *Chrysostom*. Ib. *Augustin*. p. 167. *Theodoret*. Ib. *Primasius*. Ib. *Sedulius*. p. 168. *Concilium Hispalense 2dum*, Ib. *Theophylact*. Ib. *Oecumenius*. Ib. *The Canon Law*. p. 169. *Jerom*. Ib.

The *Exceptions* against *Jerom's* Testimony examin'd, p. 171.

S E C T. VI.

Mr Rhind's Reasonings against the *Presbyterian Ruling Elders and Deacons*, Examn'd. p. 175.

ART. I. His Reasonings against the *Presbyterian Ruling Elders*, Examn'd p. 176

ART. II. His Reasonings against the *Presbyterian Deacons*, Examn'd. p. 185.

THE CONCLUSION OF THE CHAPTER CONCERNING CHURCH-GOVERNMENT. p. 187.

An *Address* to the *Gentlemen of High-Church* Principles shewing the *Uncharitableness* of them, and how destructive they are of the whole *Protestant Interest* through the *World*, p. 188. Their confidence upon their Principles so much the less tolerable that they are *Groundless*. p. 192.

Chap. III.

MR *Rhind's* Second Reason for Separating from the *Presbyterians*, viz. That their *Articles of Faith* are *fundamentally False and Pernicious*, Examn'd. p. 196.

The Contents.

SECT. I.

Mr Rhind's Objections against their Articles of Faith Consider'd p. 197.

His Objections against the Doctrine of the *Decrees* in General, Examin'd, Ib. His Objections against their Doctrine of *Predestination* p. 201. Against their Doctrine of the *Efficacy of Grace* p. 207. shew'd not to be inconsistent with a Good Life or unable to persuade one to Reform, in a

DIALOGUE BETWEEN a CALVINIST Teacher and a DEBAUCHE of the Party p. 209.

His Objections against the Doctrine of *Perseverance* p. 214.

SECT. II.

The *Presbyterian Articles* of Faith the same with those of the Christian Church. p. 221.

Proved that they are the Doctrine of the forreign Reformed Churches. Ib. Of the *Episcopalians* in Scotland p. 222. Of the Church of England p. 223. The Defences of some Modern Divines against this Imputation particularly consider'd p. 224. The Calvinistick Doctrines asserted to be the Doctrines of the Church of England 1st by the *English Universities* p. 226. 2^{dly}, by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Governours of the Church p. 227. 3^{dly}, by the Court p. 229. Lastly, by the *English Delegates* to forreign Synods Ib. Proved that the Doctrines objected against are the Doctrines of the Catholic Church p. 230.

Chap IV.

MR Rhind's Third Reason for separating from the Presbyterians viz. That their *Worship* is fundamentally Corrupt and Imperfect, Examin'd p. 233.

SECT. I.

His Objections against the *Presbyterian's Prayers* Examin'd. p. 234.

ART. I. His Argument and Ten Instances for Proving that the Matter of them must be and is Corrupt Examin'd. Ib.

ART. II. His Exceptions against the Manner of the *Presbyterian's Prayers* Examin'd, p. 248.

The alledged *Disadvantages of Extemporary Prayer* Consider'd.

Ib. His Arguments for proving the Excellency of the Liturgick Way

The Contents.

Way Examined. p. 251. His Argument for it from the *Nature of the Thing* Ib. 2dly from *Universal Practice* p. 257. 3dly, from *Heaven's Approbation* of it under the *Old and New Testament*. p. 259. 4thly, from the *Usage* of it in the *Primitive and Ancient Church* p. 261. Lastly from the *Practice of the Reformed Churches*. p. 262.

Mr. Rhind's Answer to the Objection against restricting People to *Forms* viz. *That they Stint the Spirit*, Considered p. 263. His horrid Comment on the *Spirit's Helping our Infirmities*. p. 264.

S E C T. II.

The *Objections* against the *Presbyterian Doctrine* concerning the *Sacraments*, and *Exceptions* against their *Manner* of Dispensing them, Consider'd p. 272.

These Discours'd. 1st as to *Baptism*. Ib. 2dly, as to the *Lord's Supper*. p. 279.

Some Remarks on the *Scots Episcopal Liturgy* p. 285.

Chap. V.

MR. Rhind's Fourth Reason for *Separating* from the *Presbyterians* viz. *That their Spirit is Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel*, Examined. p. 289.

The Meaning and Intendment of this Reason. Ib. Several Things Charged on the *Presbyterians* which they not only Confess but avow. p. 291. Mr. Rhind's Prophaneness in Burlesquing the *Scripture* p. 292.

This Reason consider'd as to its Weight, and proved that tho' it were true, yet it alone would not Justify his *Separation* p. 295.

His Reason Examined as to its *Truth*, p. 296. The *Presbyterian Spirit* not *Enthusiastical* p. 297. Not an *Animal* or *Mechanical Spirit* p. 301 Not a *Partial Damning Spirit* p. 303. Not a *Narrow* or *Mean Spirit* p. 304. Not a *Malicious* or *Unforgiving Spirit*, p. 306. Not an *Unconversible Spirit* p. 311. Not a *Disloyal* or *Rebellious Spirit* p. 313.

A Short Digression on the Right Honourable the Earl of Cromer's Historical Account of the Conspiracies by the Earls of Gowrie p. 317.

The *Presbyterian Spirit* not a *Spirit of Division* p. 330. Not an *Unneighbourly*, *Cruel* or *Barbarous Spirit*. p. 33 :

The CONCLUSION p. 340.







